DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 345 378 EA 023 976

TITLE	Chapter 2 Federal, State, and Local Partnership for Educational Improvement: Evaluation of Program Effectiveness for School Year 1990-91.
INSTITUTION	Texas Education Agency, Austin.
PUB DATE	Mar 92
NOTE	172p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Texas Education Agency, 1701 North Congress Avenue, Austin, TX 78701-1494.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Aid; *Federal State Relationship; *Program Evaluation; *School Districts; *State Legislation; Surveys
IDENTIFIERS	*Texas

ABSTRACT

The evaluation of Chapter 2 program effectiveness for 1990-91 was conducted to comply with the accountability measures established by Congress in 1988. This report presents evaluation research findings concerning Chapter 2 programs implemented by local school districts and Chapter 2 discretionary projects directed by the Texas Education Agency in 1990-91. The evaluation research plan for Texas was developed in accordance with State Advisory Committee recommendations regarding data collection from local school districts with Chapter 2 programs in six targeted areas: (1) programs to provide services for at-risk students; (2) training and professional development programs for educational personnel; (3) innovative programs including those for "effective schools"; (4) programs that enhance personal excellence of students and student achievement; (5) innovative projects to enhance the educational program and climate of the school; and (6) acquisition of instructional and educational matterials. Questionnaires were mailed to 50 out of 1,041 districts that implemented Chapter 2 programs, and site visits were made in 10 of the sample districts. The assessment scope was confined to short-term or intermediate impacts. Data indicated that the schools were conscientious about applying Chapter 2 funds and evaluating programs. The local school districts and private nonprofit schools participating in the evaluation study conducted programs that varied in scope and depth and shared objectives related to improving existing educational programs and influencing students' educational experiences. Chapter 2 programs contributed significantly to school districts' students, faculty, and staff. Evaluation of discretionary projects was equally positive. Appendices list participating districts and demographic profiles, and present letters and instructions, survey instruments, and a statewide summary of Chapter 2 targeted assistance programs. (MLH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED345378

EA 023 976

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

CHAPTER 2
FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL PARTNERSHIP FOR EDUCATIONAL IMPROVEMENT

EVALUATION OF PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS FOR SCHOOL YEAR 1990-91

Texas Education Agency
Austin, Texas

March 1992

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
L. Kemp
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

CHAPTER 2
FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL PARTNERSHIP FOR EDUCATIONAL IMPROVEMENT

EVALUATION OF PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS FOR SCHOOL YEAR 1990-91

Additional copies of this report may be obtained from the Document Control Center in the Division of Contracts and Grants Administration at the Texas Education Agency. Address requests to:

Texas Education Agency
Document Control Center
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701-1494
(512) 463-9304

Please refer to the following information when requesting additional copies of this report.

Chapter 2 Federal, State, and Local Partnership for Educational Improvement: Evaluation of program Effectiveness for School Year 1990-91.
March 1992

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY
AUSTIN, TEXAS
MARCH 1992

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
(State Board for Vocational Education)

CAROLYN HONEA CRAWFORD, Beaumont
Chairman of the State Board of Education
District 7

BOB AIKIN, Commerce
Vice Chairman of the State Board of Education
District 9

MARY HELEN BERLANGA, Corpus Christi
Secretary of the State Board of Education
District 2

Board Members

RAYMOND A. ALEXANDER, Houston
District 4

JACK CHRISTIE, Houston
District 6

EMMETT J. CONRAD, Dallas
District 13

WILL D. DAVIS, Austin
District 10

MONTE HASIE, Lubbock
District 15

WILLIAM L. HUDSON, Wichita Falls
District 14

GERALDINE MILLER, Dallas
District 12

JANE NELSON, Double Oak
District 11

RENE NUÑEZ, El Paso
District 1

MARY KNOTTS PERKINS, Lufkin
District 8

JOHN H. SHIELDS, San Antonio
District 5

ESTEBAN SOSA, San Antonio
District 3

LIONEL R. MENO
Commissioner of Education
(Executive Officer of the State Board of Education)

Committees
of the
State Board of Education

PERSONNEL
RENE NUÑEZ, Chairman
JACK CHRISTIE
EMMETT J. CONRAD
CAROLYN HONEA CRAWFORD
JOHN H. SHIELDS

STUDENTS
GERALDINE MILLER, Chairman
RAYMOND A. ALEXANDER
MARY HELEN BERLANGA
MONTE HASIE
MARY KNOTTS PERKINS

SCHOOL FINANCE
WILL D. DAVIS, Chairman
BOB AIKIN
WILLIAM L. HUDSON
JANE NELSON
ESTEBAN SOSA

LONG-RANGE PLANNING
EMMETT J. CONRAD, Chairman
RAYMOND A. ALEXANDER
JACK CHRISTIE
CAROLYN HONEA CRAWFORD
WILL D. DAVIS
JANE NELSON
MARY KNOTTS PERKINS
JOHN H. SHIELDS

PERMANENT SCHOOL FUND
ESTEBAN SOSA, Chairman
BOB AIKIN
MARY HELEN BERLANGA
MONTE HASIE
WILLIAM L. HUDSON
GERALDINE MILLER
RENE NUÑEZ

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This report was prepared by the Texas Education Agency's Division of Policy Planning and Evaluation in order to provide the United States Congress with information on the educational impact of Chapter 2-funded programs as it considers the reauthorization of the Chapter 2 legislation in Fiscal Year 1993.

The Texas Education Agency appreciates the efforts of the many local school district and private nonprofit school staff who participated in the data collection for the study. Special thanks go to the Chapter 2 coordinators, directors, teachers, and staff at the districts which participated in on-site visits.

This study was conducted with considerable support from David Stamman, Robert Leos, and Cherry Kugle in the Division of Policy Planning and Evaluation and Earin Martin, Chapter 2 State Coordinator, Division of Contracts and Grants Administration.

Project Staff
Division of Policy Planning and Evaluation

Stephen Lewis
Project Manager

This document was developed and produced entirely with Elementary and Secondary Education Act Chapter 2 federal funds.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 1

PART I

BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY 9
INTRODUCTION TO THE CHAPTER 2 FEDERAL PROGRAM 15

PART II

TARGETED AREA #1: Services for At-Risk Students 25
TARGETED AREA #4: Training and Professional Development 35
TARGETED AREA #3: Schoolwide Improvement - Effective Schools 45
TARGETED AREA #5: Programs to Enhance Personal Excellence 53
TARGETED AREA #6: Innovative Projects 59
TARGETED AREA #2: Educational Materials and Equipment 67

PART III

STATE DIRECTED PROGRAMS: Discretionary Projects 77

APPENDICES

A. List of Participating School Districts 113
B. Demographic Profiles of Participating School Districts 116
C. Letter and Instructions Mailed to Participating School Districts 119
D. Survey Research Instruments 127
E. Statewide Summary of Chapter 2 Targeted Assistance Programs (80 Percent Formula Funds) 171

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

CHAPTER 2 FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL PARTNERSHIP FOR EDUCATIONAL IMPROVEMENT

EVALUATION OF PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS FOR SCHOOL YEAR 1990-91

The evaluation of Chapter 2 program effectiveness for 1990-91 was conducted by the Texas Education Agency to comply with the accountability measures established by the United States Congress in 1988. The central purpose of the evaluation was to provide Congress with information on the educational impacts of Chapter-2 funded activities as it considers legislation in 1993 to reauthorize Chapter 2 funding. Congress intended the evaluation study also to provide state educational agencies with data useful for their own plans for Chapter 2 program improvement. This report presents the findings of evaluation research conducted of Chapter 2 programs implemented by local school districts and Chapter 2 discretionary projects directed by the Texas Education Agency in 1990-91.

The research plan for conducting the evaluation of local school district programs in Texas was developed in accordance with recommendations of the State Advisory Committee for Chapter 2. These recommendations included collecting data from local school districts with Chapter 2 programs for each of the six targeted assistance areas described in the Chapter 2 statute. The amount of data to be collected for each targeted area varied according to their rank order of priority established by the advisory committee. Those six targeted areas, and their priority, were:

1. Programs to provide services for at-risk students.
2. Training and professional development programs for educational personnel.
3. Innovative programs including those for "effective schools."
4. Programs that enhance personal excellence of students and student achievement.
5. Innovative projects to enhance the educational program and climate of the school.
6. Acquisition of instructional and educational materials.

The research design involved mailing questionnaires to a representative sample (50) of the 1,041 districts that implemented Chapter 2 programs in 1990-91 and conducting site visits to ten of the sample districts. Emphasis in collecting evaluation data was placed upon assessing the *impacts* of Chapter 2 programs on participating students and faculty. The scope of the assessment was limited to discovering short-term, or intermediate impacts.

FINDINGS ON THE EFFECTIVENESS OF LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICT CHAPTER 2 PROGRAMS

The data collected from the sample of districts in Texas indicated that the schools were conscientious in their application of Chapter 2 funds and in their evaluation of Chapter 2 programs. Nearly all of the districts visited by Agency staff for this study had set up a local Chapter 2 committee that reviewed proposals from campuses and offices within the district, and awarded Chapter 2 funds on a highly competitive basis. All of the sample districts collected evaluation data routinely and had discovered for themselves benefits to students and staff made possible through programs that had been strengthened by Chapter 2 supplementary funding.

The local school districts and private nonprofit schools that participated in the effectiveness evaluation study conducted Chapter 2-sponsored programs that varied widely in scope and depth. There was no "typical" Chapter 2 project. Although the most common use of Chapter 2 funding was to acquire educational materials, many districts used their Chapter 2 funds for some special projects. Some of those special projects assisted a small group of students in several ways by providing a variety of instructional and social services, while some projects assisted a great number of students in one special way by providing a unique experience that enriched their educational experiences, and thus, their lives.

Although local district Chapter 2 projects tended to vary widely, they all shared the major objectives of improving existing educational programs and impacting the educational experiences of students. Evidence collected in this study clearly points to the fact that Chapter 2-funded programs made significant contributions to school districts' students, faculty, and staff. For some districts, Chapter 2 funds provided opportunities to expand existing instructional and extracurricular programs in order to assist groups of students that otherwise would not have been served. For other districts, Chapter 2 funds enabled them to try new and innovative programs and to evaluate their effectiveness before attempting to implement them district-wide.

In each of the targeted assistance areas, Chapter 2 programs contributed to positive student impacts evidenced by improvements in a variety of areas. The most common of those student outcomes, as reported by the districts that participated in the study, were:

- Improved classroom participation.
- Improved student attitudes about school.
- Improved conduct.
- Improved attendance.
- Improved use of instructional materials.
- Improved grades.

Other positive outcomes were reported that were of a more indirect nature, but no less real. For example, teachers participated in professional development programs where they learned new instructional strategies and became more effective, and their students benefited accordingly. Furthermore, some Chapter 2 projects provided enrichment activities that gave students new educational experiences that affected them in ways that may not be indicated through test scores and grades, but are no less significant.

These intermediate outcomes, or benefits, along with many others, are documented in this evaluation study. Most of the districts in the study already had collected such documentation through records of student progress and analysis of data collected through district-level teacher, staff, and student survey before this special evaluation study began. Further documentation is provided In this evaluation study through the Agency's survey instruments and questionnaires, and through comments made by district personnel on their survey instruments and during site visits conducted by Agency staff. Included in those comments are reports from district Chapter 2 coordinators that their Chapter 2 programs contributed important indirect benefits such as:

- Expanded services and resources to reach more students.
- Enhanced quality of districts' educational resources.
- Enhanced quality of service delivery to more students.
- Support for innovative and unique programs for students with the greatest needs.

In their written statements on the survey instruments and in their comments made during site visits, the Chapter 2 district coordinators and project directors made it overwhelmingly clear that the *best* contribution of Chapter 2 is the flexibility it gives their districts to fund educational programs that they decide can best meet their needs. Indeed, it is because Chapter 2 rules allow districts flexibility to meet their special needs that Chapter 2 programs can make significant impacts at the school district and local campus level.

Although Chapter 2 programs at the local school level represent the major use of Chapter 2 funds, the state-directed Chapter 2 programs funded through the discretionary allotment also make important contributions to schools and school administration in Texas. The implementation of, and benefits derived from, the 1990-91 discretionary projects are summarized in the section that follows.

FINDINGS ON THE EFFECTIVENESS OF CHAPTER 2 DISCRETIONARY PROJECTS

The 1990-91 special discretionary projects were evaluated by Texas Education Agency staff. Each discretionary project had an Agency project director who worked with staff in the Division of Policy Planning and Evaluation to ensure effective project implementation and evaluation. Summary evaluation reports for each of the 1990-91 discretionary projects are included in the effectiveness evaluation report.

The discretionary projects in 1990-91 varied almost as widely as the local district Chapter 2 projects. Most of the projects involved collaborations between the state agency and local school districts for the purpose of conducting pilot studies of promising educational programs. The findings of those pilot studies will be used by the participating districts and other interested districts to guide them in making decisions about starting and, or expanding one, or more of those promising programs.

The state agency benefited from participating in the discretionary pilot projects by learning which programs worked and what program requirements were essential for success. Such information improved the Agency's ability to provide sound technical assistance to school districts that seek advice in order to weigh the costs and potential benefits of starting new, innovative programs. The state also benefited by enriching the training and professional development of Agency staff. The skills developed and the information learned by Agency personnel who attended training programs made possible by Chapter 2 supplementary funding will be passed on to the school districts in the form of better technical assistance and advice.

Several districts benefited directly through their participation in the discretionary projects. For example, in the project for enhancing the quality and retention of minority teachers, the participating districts were better able to prepare their teachers for "surviving" their first year and were able to retain an improved percentage of their first-year teachers. Among some of the other benefits to school districts, and to the state agency, attributable to the discretionary projects were:

- Prospective teachers were prepared to pass the ExCET examination in order to become qualified to teach in Texas.

- Parents of at-risk students developed important parenting skills while participating in adult literacy classes, GED classes, and vocational training classes funded through adult basic education and vocational education programs

- Latchkey children were given much needed social and instructional services.

- Students who had failed the TAAS examination were provided tutoring that enabled them to pass the test at later administrations and to graduate or to be promoted to the next grade.

- Teachers in science gained mastery of new curriculum and instructional techniques that they will be sharing with their peers.

- Research was conducted that not only provided valuable information about at-risk students and prekindergarten programs, but opened doors for future collaborative research efforts between the state agency and local school districts.

- School district personnel learned more about the components of effective schools and their relevance in the school accreditation process.

The accomplishments made through the discretionary projects mean more than the benefits to the individuals participating in them. Indeed, the discretionary projects have been beneficial to the extent that they have made important contributions to Texas Education Agency's effort to accomplish the long-range goals for educational improvement in Texas established by the State Board of Education. No proposed discretionary project received funding unless it indicated its potential value for meeting one or more long-range educational goals. The process of awarding discretionary funding to projects on a competitive basis, and requiring that they address elements of the state board's long range plan for school improvement, should ensure that effective use of Chapter 2 discretionary funds will continue into the future.

PART I

- BACKGROUND TO THE EVALUATION STUDY
- INTRODUCTION TO THE CHAPTER 2 FEDERAL PROGRAM: AUTHORIZATION, STATE, AND LOCAL ADMINISTRATION

BACKGROUND TO THE EFFECTIVENESS EVALUATION STUDY OF CHAPTER 2

In 1988, the United States Congress established a series of new accountability measures for Chapter 2 programs that included the requirement that State Education Agencies (SEAs) conduct a comprehensive effectiveness evaluation of state and local Chapter 2 programs (P.L. 100-297, Chapter 2, Section 1522(a)(6)(B). The effectiveness evaluation report is due to the Secretary of Education in March 1992. The central purpose of the evaluation report is to provide Congress with information on the educational impact of Chapter 2 funded activities as it considers the reauthorization of the legislation in Fiscal Year 1993. Congress also intended that state educational agencies should conduct evaluations that will provide them with data useful for their own statewide agenda for Chapter 2 program improvement.

To assist the states in conducting the comprehensive effectiveness evaluation and reporting the research results, the U.S. Department of Education provided a technical assistance guide, "Guidance to States on Evaluating the Effectiveness of the Chapter 2 Program." This document provided formal guidance to the states in designing and implementing the congressionally mandated evaluation.

In addition, the Department of Education sponsored a Chapter 2 Steering Committee meeting in Denver, Colorado in April 1990 so that state coordinators and evaluators could meet to discuss and develop, if possible, a common research methodology for conducting the evaluation. Workshop sessions also were held in Washington, D.C. in February 1991 at the national Chapter 2 conference to provide further information, ideas, and examples from other states about how to conduct the evaluation project. The technical assistance provided by the Department of Education was intended to be advisory and not prescriptive. States were given the flexibility to design an evaluation methodology that would satisfy both the legislative mandate and meet the needs of their own departments of education.

SCOPE OF THE STATE EVALUATION EFFORTS

The U. S. Department of Education made it clear in its advice to states that it was neither necessary to collect evaluation information from all local school districts, nor to evaluate every Chapter 2 targeted area in which programs were conducted. The states could choose, therefore, to collect and report data on Chapter 2 activities for one or more of the targeted assistance areas and from a sample of school districts.

With the flexibility to be original in their evaluation design, states were constrained to address, at the very least, three central questions:

- What educational services are funded by Chapter 2?
- What students and staff are affected by those services?
- What are the educational impacts of those services on schools' curriculum and instruction, on school staff, and on students?

These questions were to be asked for each of the six targeted assistance areas that were to be evaluated. Emphasis was placed on the issue of "educational impacts."

States which chose to focus on only some of the targeted assistance areas were required to identify the specific targets of their evaluation and to justify their selection. Three criteria for narrowing the evaluation's focus were suggested:

1. The proportion of funds allocated to the activity
2. The proportion of LEAs conducting the activity
3. The extent to which the activity addresses what has been identified by the state as a significant need.

THE TEXAS CHAPTER 2 EVALUATION PLAN

The Evaluation Plan used by the state of Texas was developed in accordance with recommendations provided by the State Advisory Committee for Chapter 2. The Committee made two recommendations: (1) reduce the data collection burden of school districts by selecting a sample of districts to participate in the study and by using relevant data that may already exist, and (2) collect data on each of the "targeted areas" according to a rank order of priorities. The targeted areas were ranked according to the amount of emphasis each should receive in the evaluation project. The order of priorities was as follows:

Priority	Targeted Assistance Area
40%	Targeted Area #1: Programs targeted for at-risk students.
20%	Targeted Area #4: Training and professional development programs.
15%	Targeted Area #3: Innovative programs including "effective schools" programs.
10%	Targeted Area #5: Programs that enhance personal excellence of students and student achievement.
10%	Targeted Area #6: Other innovative projects to enhance the educational program and climate of the school.
5%	Targeted Area #2: Acquisition of instructional/educational materials.

The evaluation design employed a mix of data collection methods and procedures to collect information for all six of the targeted assistance areas. Data were collected for a representative sample of the 1,041 districts with Chapter 2 programs in 1990-91.

The research plan to guide data collection was based on the fact that Chapter 2 projects are interrelated with a school district's general school improvement efforts and operate simultaneously with other programs. Many Chapter 2-funded activities do not directly affect the academic performance of the students being targeted or served, and many programs target not a small group of students, but a district's entire student body. The implication, therefore, is that Chapter 2-sponsored programs must be assessed in terms of their contributions to existing school improvement efforts. Assessments of Chapter 2 programs' impact on students and faculty can still be made, but the scope of those assessments often must be limited to discovering short-term, or intermediate effects upon program participants. Long-term impact analysis will need to be reserved for those few programs that directly serve students in a unique program over a sufficient period of time for long-lasting effects to occur.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The data collection plan used by the State of Texas addressed questions regarding project implementation, intermediate effects upon participants, and perceptions of participants on the benefits of Chapter 2 programs. The research activities emphasized collecting data to discover intermediate outcomes or effects. Intermediate outcomes are those short-term changes, such as improved attendance or improved attitudes about school, in students or staff who participated in a Chapter 2 program. The focus on intermediate effects is consistent with the guidance provided by the U. S. Department of Education. Long- term effects, such as improvement in achievement test scores that indicate academic growth, cannot be properly studied through this one-year "snapshot" evaluation project. Whenever possible, however, data were collected that indicated the possibility of long-term improvement due to successful implementation of Chapter 2 programs.

Three general questions guided the research:

1. To what extent were Chapter 2 programs successfully implemented?
2. What were the intermediate effects upon students, teachers, and district staff who participated in the programs?
3. What are some of the perceptions of school district personnel related to the benefits of Chapter 2-sponsored projects?

SAMPLING FRAME

For the purpose of this evaluation study, data were collected from a sample of the 1,041 public school districts with Chapter 2 programs. This approach allowed for acquiring more extensive information from a smaller, yet representative, number of local school districts instead of obtaining a small amount of data from all districts. A list of 64 school districts was drawn using a computer program; a final research sample size of 50 school districts was selected from that list.

The research sample was stratified along three variables: (1) size of student enrollment as measured by average daily attendance, (2) geographic location (measured by location in one of twenty educational service center regions), and (3) percent of students of ethnic minority status. Data on these demographic variables were provided for each of the districts through the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) computer data files located at the Texas Education Agency. The distribution of the districts selected by the sampling program was closely representative of the distribution of school districts statewide on those three variables.

An initial sample of 64 school districts was chosen in order to ensure that enough districts with actual Chapter 2 funds would be selected. A review of the 1990-91 Chapter 2 applications for the initial sample found that all 64 of the sample districts had applied for Chapter 2 funds. Subsequently, 14 districts were removed from the sample in order to attain the research sample size of 50. In order to select districts to be excluded, each of the sample districts was classified and tabulated according to the three demographic variables: 1) percent ethnic minority students, 2) average daily attendance, and 3) geographic location (Education Service Center region). This tabulation made it possible to exclude districts and still maintain the representativeness of the original sample of 64 districts. The initial tabulation revealed that three regions were not represented in the original sample. To ensure that all Education Service Center (ESC) regions were represented, three districts from regions that were overrepresented in the sample were replaced by one district from each of the three nonrepresented regions. More detailed information about the sample districts is provided in four tables provided in Appendix A.

RESEARCH METHODS

Data were collected in two stages:

I. Questionnaire survey of the districts in the sample.
II. Case studies involving site visits to ten districts in the sample.

Stage I: Survey Research

The survey research objective was to collect demographic data and self-reported effectiveness data from the sample districts. The focus was upon collecting data pertaining to program implementation and to indicators of intermediate outcomes. To obtain information regarding program implementation entailed collecting simple process data such as the number of students served, the number of faculty and staff involved, the number of teachers trained, the funds expended, and the level of project implementation. To discover possible intermediate outcomes, data were collected which included faculty and staff perceptions of the success of the project and short-term, noticeable changes in students' school involvement and participation, in academic achievement, and in attitudes about school. Survey instruments were created and field tested by staff in the Division of Policy Planning and Evaluation. Separate instruments were created for each of the six targeted assistance areas.

The survey instruments were directed to the attention of the district Chapter 2 director, or coordinator, where such a position existed. Where a district did not have a Chapter 2 director, materials were given to the person in the district who was most familiar with the Chapter 2 program. The survey targeted the Chapter 2 directors, or those people most familiar with the program, because these respondents would have in-depth knowledge of the Chapter 2 programs for the entire district. Respondents also included principals and teachers who worked directly with students in Chapter 2 programs or otherwise participated in those programs.

In order to discover which targeted assistance area, or areas, a participating district addressed, the district's annual application to the Texas Education Agency for Chapter 2 funding was reviewed. The district applications for funding contain information about the amount of funds to be budgeted per Chapter 2 program, as well as information on how many students will be served and how many teachers and, or administrators will be participating. A list was created from the review of applications that identified each district according to the targeted area(s) it addressed.

A participating district received only those survey instruments relevant to its Chapter 2 programs. Along with the appropriate surveys and instructions, a cover letter was sent to district superintendents informing them of their selection in the study, the study's purpose and objective, and how to collect and submit data to the Agency. Copies of all survey instruments, data collection forms, and the letter to district superintendents are attached in the Appendices.

Stage II: Site Visit Interviews and Observations

Paper survey instruments such as questionnaires provide a large amount of information at reasonable cost, but seldom obtain more in-depth information and, therefore, cannot tell the whole story of Chapter 2. To get more in-depth information, it is necessary to talk to the people most directly involved with and affected by Chapter 2 programs. It is also helpful to observe first hand how a Chapter 2 program works at a particular school or in a particular classroom. In order to collect this type of information, site visits were conducted at ten of the fifty sample districts.

Ten districts were selected from the 50 in the study sample for site visits based on information about their programs as described in their Chapter 2 applications. The six largest districts in the state were included because they had programs that addressed several or all of the six targeted assistance areas. Several middle size districts were chosen and one small district was included in this sub-sample. Most of these districts had a high percentage of minority students, so one low minority school district was selected in order to balance out the sample.

Visits were conducted by two staff members of the Policy Planning and Evaluation Division of the Texas Education Agency. To make the site visits as efficient as possible, letters were mailed to districts informing them of their selection for a site visit and follow-up phone calls were made to make appointments with appropriate district staff. Visits occurred during the spring 1991 school semester with the first one occurring in February and the last one in April. The researchers went into the first site visit with general questions to guide the interview process. After that visit, a list of more specific questions was created to help guide on-site interviews so that consistent information could be collected from the different sites. Those questions are listed below:

1. What is your best example of Chapter 2 success or effectiveness?
2. What would it mean to your district to no longer have Chapter 2 funds?
3. How are your Chapter 2 projects integrated with district projects; with your overall school improvement plan?

4. What does your district do to evaluate Chapter 2 activities?
5. What has been the most important direct benefit to your district's students (or staff) that can be attributed to your Chapter 2 program(s)?

The purpose of the interviews was to find out from the participants and program leaders information about the success and effectiveness of Chapter 2-sponsored programs and activities. District personnel were given the opportunity to express in their own words both the special contribution of Chapter 2 programs to the district's general school improvement initiatives and their concerns about the consequences of losing those programs. Interviewees included the Chapter 2 director, principals, teachers, counselors, and district administrators.

Although some valuable information was obtained from interviews during the site visits, the visits proved to be more effective as opportunities for the researchers to communicate with Chapter 2 coordinators about the purpose of the effectiveness study and how they could best collect and submit information about their projects. Since this effectiveness study of Chapter 2 was the first one of its kind, most of the district coordinators that were interviewed expressed their need for information and technical assistance in complying with evaluation data. Much of the site visit time was spent talking with Chapter 2 project people---teachers, counselors, principals---about the type of information they could provide the Agency when they submitted their evaluation surveys. Thus, much of the information the researchers gained during the site visits was provided again on the survey instrument either through the closed-end items, or through the program synopses the districts prepared for each program. Consequently, the site visit data are not discussed independently of the survey data results.

INTRODUCTION TO THE CHAPTER 2 FEDERAL PROGRAM: AUTHORIZATION, STATE, AND LOCAL ADMINISTRATION

CHAPTER 2 AUTHORIZATION AND PURPOSE

Among the sources of funding for education, local property taxes, state revenues, and federal grants, the federal funding provided through Chapter 2, although by far not the largest, represents an important type of financial support for public school districts and private schools. The Chapter 2 program of federal financial aid is authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the Augustus F. Hawkins-Robert T. Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendments of 1988. The authorizing statute is Public Law 100-297, Title I, Chapter 2 Federal, State, and Local Partnership for Educational Improvement. For the sake of abbreviation, programs funded under this authorization generally are referred to as Chapter 2 programs.

The law under Chapter 2 provides funding to state and local educational agencies to assist them in implementing promising educational programs that can be supported eventually by state and local funding after such programs are demonstrated to be effective. These promising programs funded by Chapter 2 serve both public and private nonprofit school students and may have one or more of the following purposes: to support innovative, educational improvement; to supplement library and instructional materials; to assist in meeting the special educational needs of at-risk and high-cost students; to enhance the quality of teaching and learning through initiating and expanding effective schools programs; and to allow state and local educational agencies to meet their educational needs and priorities for special, *targeted* assistance programs. These targeted assistance areas are described in the authorizing statute (P.L. 100-297).

CHAPTER 2 SUPPLEMENTS LOCAL PROGRAMS

According to ESEA Chapter 2 law, Chapter 2 funds can be used only to supplement and, where practical, to increase the level of state and local funds made already available from non-federal sources. Chapter 2 funds are not used to substitute funds from non-federal sources. Thus, an educational program activity required by state law or by State Board of Education rules cannot be funded with Chapter 2 monies. Neither can these funds be used to maintain educational activities which had been previously funded from nonfederal sources by the state or local school district.

STATE ADMINISTRATION AND FUND ALLOCATION

The state of Texas receives federal Chapter 2 funds based on the population of school-age children. The Texas Education Agency has the primary responsibility for administering Chapter 2 funds. Administrative responsibilities include designing and managing discretionary projects; allocating, distributing, and monitoring the use of funds to school districts; evaluating local programs and state level discretionary projects; and disseminating Chapter 2 program evaluation results.

Texas distributes no less than 80 percent of its Chapter 2 funds to local school districts through a standard application system based on a formula prescribed by law. The remaining 20 percent of Chapter 2 funds are reserved for state use. State-reserved funds are used for a variety of special discretionary projects administered by the Texas Education Agency, as well as for the administration of Chapter 2 programs. Of the 20 percent set aside for state use, at least 20 percent of those funds must be used for effective schools programs. No more than 25 percent of the total funds reserved for state use are used to administer the Chapter 2 program.

A total of $33,335,356 was allocated to the State of Texas for Chapter 2 during fiscal year 1990-91: $26,668,285 was allocated to school districts (80 percent formula funds) through the application system; $5,000,304 was reserved for special discretionary projects, including $2,009,841 for effective schools programs; and $1,666,767 was reserved by the agency for state administration. Some 1989-90 carryover funds also were used to support 1990-91 program activities.

SCHOOL LEVEL ADMINISTRATION

Local educational agencies, through their school superintendents, principals, classroom teachers, and supporting personnel, have primary responsibility for designing and implementing the programs funded under Chapter 2. Local school districts and schools have this responsibility because Congress recognized that school personnel, and not the state education agency, have the most direct contact with students, are most directly responsible to parents, and are the most capable to create and implement programs to meet the educational needs of their students. In designing Chapter 2 programs, school districts are constrained to address one or more of six targeted assistance areas specified by law. These targeted areas are:

1) Programs to meet the educational needs of students at risk of failure in school and of dropping out and students for whom providing an education entails higher than average costs.

2) Programs for the acquisition and use of instructional and educational materials, including library books, reference materials, computer software and hardware for instructional use, and other curricular materials that would be used to improve the quality of instruction.

3) Innovative programs designed to carry out schoolwide improvements, including the effective schools program.

4) Programs of training and professional development to enhance the knowledge and skills of educational personnel, including teachers, librarians, school counselors and other pupil services personnel, and administrators and school board members.

5) Programs designed to enhance personal excellence of students and student achievement, including instruction in ethics, performing and creative arts, humanities, activities in physical fitness and comprehensive health education, and participation in community service projects.

6) Other innovative projects which would enhance the educational program and climate of the school, including programs for gifted and talented students, technology education programs, early childhood education programs, community education and programs for youth suicide prevention.

Except for certain provisions in the law, school districts have complete discretion in determining how funds are divided among the targeted assistance program areas.

FORMULA FUNDS DISTRIBUTED TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS

The 80 percent formula entitlement funds of the Chapter 2 federal allotment are distributed to local educational agencies in Texas according to a formula that uses three factors: (1) public school enrollment, (2) private nonprofit school enrollment, and (3) number of high cost students (those eligible for free or reduced-price lunch). Only local educational agencies with numbers or percentages in excess of the average statewide number or percentage are eligible to include high cost students in the computation. School districts apply for Chapter 2 funds from the Texas Education Agency through the Standard Application System (SAS) through which the district describes the proposed use of funds among the six authorized targeted assistance program areas described by law. During the 1990-91 school year, 1,041 out of 1,065 Texas school districts received Chapter 2 program funds.

School district applicants must consult with appropriate groups of constituents in the design and implementation of Chapter 2 programs. These constituents include teachers, administrative personnel, and parents of children attending public and private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools in the area the district serves. Through this consultation, districts ensure that private nonprofit school students have equal opportunity to participate in Chapter 2 programs.

PRIVATE NONPROFIT SCHOOL PARTICIPATION

Private nonprofit school children make up approximately 3 percent of the enrollment of school children in Texas. The state educational agency and the local educational agencies, through consultation with appropriate officials, assure equitable participation of private nonprofit schools in Chapter 2 services, materials, equipment, and teacher training programs. Local school districts that apply for Chapter 2 funds must consult with private nonprofit school officials in the design and development of its Chapter 2 program when private school officials desire that their children participate. All entities receiving Chapter 2 funds must ensure that private nonprofit school children have the opportunity to participate fully in Chapter 2 programs. The 1990-91 Comprehensive Effectiveness Evaluation Report includes data representative of participating private nonprofit school children and teachers.

SPECIAL DISCRETIONARY PROJECTS

The Texas Education Agency uses a portion of the funding set aside for state use (20 percent of the allotment) to fund special discretionary projects. These special projects address one or more of the six targeted assistance program areas authorized by law and also correspond to one or more of the State Board of Education's long-range goals and objectives. For the 1990-91 school year, special discretionary projects focused primarily on three targeted assistance areas: (1) programs to meet the educational needs of students at risk or of failing, (2) programs of training and professional development, and (3) effective schools programs.

During 1990-91, fifteen special discretionary projects were conducted by the Agency. Although the Agency managed these projects at the state level, it distributed most of the funding to school districts which implemented and directed the projects locally. These local school district projects generally are pilot studies that are conducted in order to determine the feasibility of implementing similar programs across the state. Forty-nine individual school districts and all twenty regional education service centers were involved in locally directed discretionary projects.

REGIONAL EDUCATION SERVICE CENTERS

The State of Texas contains twenty educational regions with one Education Service Center (ESC) located in each region. The ESCs have evolved from media distribution facilities into regional institutions that assist school districts in a broad range of cooperative efforts to support statewide initiatives for school improvement. Regional education service centers participate in the planning, development, coordination, implementation, and evaluation of educational programs within the state's twenty service regions. The Education Service Centers focus their efforts on making quality ideas, services, information, and teaching materials available to local school districts. In regard to Chapter 2 programs, educational service centers may serve as fiscal agents for school districts that elect to form a Chapter 2 cooperative, or consortium, in order to apply for funds and participate in activities on a cost effective basis.

CHAPTER 2 STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

To help provide a direction for Chapter 2 programs, the Chapter 2 statute requires the governor of each state to appoint a state advisory committee that is broadly representative of the educational interests of the general public. The interests represented include public and private elementary and secondary school children; classroom teachers; parents of elementary and secondary school children; local boards of education; local and regional school administrators; institutions of higher education; the state legislature; elementary and secondary school librarians; school counselors and other pupil services personnel. For the 1990-91 school year, the Chapter 2 state advisory committee consisted of ten members determined by the Governor to be representative of all groups.

The Chapter 2 Advisory Committee makes recommendations to the Commissioner of Education and the State Board of Education in three broad areas: (1) allocating Chapter 2 funds reserved for state use, (2) the formula for allocating funds to school districts, and (3) planning, developing, supporting, implementing, and evaluating special discretionary projects sponsored under Chapter 2. The Advisory Committee reviews and comments upon summary evaluation results of Chapter 2 activities, including the evaluation information for 1990-91 contained in the comprehensive effectiveness evaluation report.

The advisory committee members received a draft of the 1990-91 comprehensive evaluation report and were requested to return their comments to the Texas Education Agency. The committee members approved the effectiveness evaluation report during the March 1992 advisory committee meeting. The advisory committee members' comments on the findings of the report are summarized as follows:

> *The most positive or noteworthy results generated from the evaluation research were from those programs which provide individual attention to students, which prepare teachers and administrators through appropriate professional staff development to meet the changes occurring in educational management and instructional techniques, and which involve parents in the education of their children. The Chapter 2 discretionary projects which involved partnerships between schools, parents, and their communities seem to have resulted in the most positive outcomes for all parties involved. Programs targeted directly toward student performance also seem very effective. Information regarding effective staff development programs, as well as other successful Chapter 2 activities, should be shared more willingly among districts so as to avoid reinventing the wheel. All programs conducted through the discretionary projects, whether they be one-year, or multi-year projects, should provide detailed follow-up information of the outcomes produced as a result of the programs.*

PROGRAM MONITORING

Texas Education Agency staff monitor approximately 1,041 school districts in Texas that receive federal funds, including Chapter 2, during a five-year monitoring cycle. Approximately 250 districts per year are monitored from mid-September through the end of May. Staff also conduct follow-up visits to districts that require additional monitoring. Extensive technical assistance is provided to districts during these monitoring visits to help them reach and maintain compliance with applicable laws, regulations, and guidelines.

PROGRAM EVALUATION

Evaluation of local school district programs funded through the formula entitlement process is the responsibility of the school district. School districts report to the Agency annually on the use of funds, types of services provided to students and staff, and number of students served under Chapter 2. Appendix E contains the statewide totals for the number of students served under each targeted assistance program area, as

24

well as the total budgeted amounts for all public schools, nonpublic schools, and the combined public and nonpublic schools with 1990-91 Chapter 2 programs.

Special discretionary projects are evaluated at the Texas Education Agency which assigns a project director to each project. Each discretionary project director works collaboratively with staff in the Division of Policy Planning and Evaluation who provide evaluation assistance for all of the discretionary projects. Where a discretionary project involves programs conducted at the school district level, the district-level project managers collect, analyze, and report data to the Agency. Agency staff summarize and report the information to the Chapter 2 Advisory Committee and to the United States Department of Education. These Chapter 2 discretionary project evaluation reports provide information which has proven useful for future planning and policy decisions regarding allocating Chapter 2 discretionary funds. Evaluation summaries of the 1990-91 discretionary projects are provided in Part III of this report.

DISSEMINATION EFFORTS

The Texas Education Agency disseminates information regarding Chapter 2 projects, activities, services, products, and evaluation results to various audiences. These audiences include the state legislature, the State Board of Education, the Commissioner of Education, professional teacher associations and organizations, parents, teachers, administrators and school board members of local educational agencies, education service centers, private nonprofit schools and organizations, interested businesses, appropriate committees and task forces, early childhood associations, and the state advisory committee for Chapter 2. The Agency employs a variety of means to disseminate information including: participation in regional, state and national conferences and workshops; annual meetings; articles in newsletters, newspapers, and journals; educator resource centers and clearinghouses; curriculum publications, evaluation reports, manuals, and handbooks for replication; publications about projects distributed at meetings and by mail to school districts and education service centers; videos, pamphlets, and brochures disseminated at conferences; teacher and education administrator training sessions; transfer of knowledge from teacher to student; information forums and display booths at information fairs.

The Texas Education Agency's *Dropout Information Clearinghouse*, operated by the Division of Instruction, disseminates model program materials, replication manuals, and other information about Chapter 2 programs for students who are at risk of failing or of dropping out. The Agency's *Clearinghouse of Promising Programs*, located in the Division of Exemplary Instruction, distributes information about exemplary Chapter 2 programs to school districts and regional education service centers.

As required by ESEA Chapter 2 law, the 1990-91 Comprehensive Effectiveness Evaluation Report is available to the public. Detailed evaluation information for all Chapter 2 projects is maintained at the Texas Education Agency. For further information regarding individual discretionary projects discussed in this report, contact the Division of Contracts and Grants Administration. For more detailed information on Chapter 2 programs among the school districts that participated in the effectiveness study, contact the Division of Policy Planning and Evaluation.

PART II

- **EFFECTIVENESS OF LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICT CHAPTER 2 PROGRAMS IN TEXAS: RESEARCH FINDINGS**

EFFECTIVENESS OF LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICT CHAPTER 2 PROGRAMS IN TEXAS

RESEARCH FINDINGS

Research findings from the survey of the 50 school districts selected for the evaluation study are presented for each of the six targeted areas. The targeted areas are discussed in the order of priority established by the Texas Chapter 2 Advisory Committee which was presented earlier in this report. In reporting the findings for each targeted area, the format for discussing the data was kept as consistent as possible while allowing to differ appropriately in order to accommodate the unique information for each targeted area.

As mentioned earlier, the survey instruments that were developed by the Texas Education Agency had some items common to all six targeted assistance areas and some items unique to each targeted area. Two additional questionnaires were created and included along with the main survey instruments for those sample school districts that had programs in either one, or both of the targeted areas, *Effective Schools Programs* and *Training and Professional Development Programs*. The school districts with programs in those targeted areas were instructed to administer their second questionnaire to a sample of their teachers, or administrators, who participated in the appropriate Chapter 2 program. Those districts were instructed further to collect and tabulate the questionnaire data and submit their findings, along with their main survey instrument data, to the Agency. At the Agency, staff in the Division of Policy Planning and Evaluation compiled and analyzed the questionnaire data from all those districts for inclusion in this report.

Much of the information presented in the following report sections represent quantitative analysis of the data provided by the districts in response to closed-ended items on the various survey instruments. Additional information was collected through a narrative component on the survey that gave district Chapter 2 coordinators, directors, and teachers an opportunity to report their perceptions and beliefs about their Chapter 2 programs' effectiveness. The narrative comments were analyzed and are discussed in each report section. Also included are a few representative examples of the comments provided by school district personnel.

Two program synopses are included at the end of each targeted area report section that were selected as particularly noteworthy from the collection of program synopses the districts prepared for each of their Chapter 2 programs. The synopses for all of the Chapter 2 programs, the survey instruments, and some additional materials and project reports provided voluntarily by several districts, are on file at the Division of Policy Planning and Evaluation, Texas Education Agency.

TARGETED AREA #1

"Programs to meet the educational needs of students at risk of failure in school and of dropping out and students for whom providing an education entails higher than average costs."

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

PROGRAMS: Out of the 50 sample school districts, 24 districts had programs that targeted this area. Because some of those districts had more than one program, there were 36 programs that targeted at-risk students.

FUNDS EXPENDED: The 24 districts expended $1,772,180 in this targeted area.

Statewide, $7,100,568 were expended by public schools in this targeted area. Funds expended on each program in the 24 sample districts ranged between $400 for a program that directly served a small group of at-risk students, to $215,637 for a program that targeted all at-risk students in one of the largest urban school districts.

NUMBER OF STUDENTS SERVED:

Pre-K - Grade 5	40,110
Grade 6 - 8	19,901
Grade 9 - 12	39,341
Total:	99,352

NUMBER OF STAFF INVOLVED: 1,381 staff in the 24 participating districts.

This figure includes all faculty, counselors, and administrative staff in the sample districts who participated in the 36 Chapter 2 programs for at-risk students.

PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION:

Implemented and expanded	5	(15%)
Implemented	19	(58%)
Partially implemented	9	(27%)
Total Programs Reporting	33	

PROFILE OF THE SAMPLE DISTRICTS

For the purpose of providing a profile of the participating school districts, data were collected for two categories that describe districts according to (1) average number of students attending school daily and, (2) the percentage of students in a district that are of ethnic minority status. The distribution of these 24 districts among those two demographic variables is presented in Table 1 on the next page below.

As the data in Table 1 indicate, four of the six largest school districts had programs to provide services for at-risk students. These districts also had 50 percent or more of their students of ethnic minority status. Altogether, 13 (54 percent) of the 24 districts fell into the highest "Percent Ethnic Minority" category ("50% & over").

TABLE 1

SERVICES FOR AT-RISK STUDENTS: DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF DISTRICTS

	Average Daily Attendance					
Percent Ethnic Minority	**> 50,000**	**25,000-49,000**	**10,000-24,999**	**5,000-9,999**	**3,000-5,000**	**1,600-3,000**
50% & over	4	3	3		3	
30% - 49%			4		1	
20% - 29%		1	1	1		
10% - 19%			1	1		1

TYPES OF PROGRAMS

Districts had great flexibility in determining which of the six targeted areas their Chapter 2-sponsored program addressed and in creating a program that had the broad purpose of helping at-risk students. Consequently, a wide variety of programs were administered by the 24 districts in the study group under the umbrella of this particular targeted area. Some of these programs had specific names to identify them, while others were simply described as dropout prevention programs. A partial listing of those programs is provided to help illustrate their variety:

- Support services for students with dyslexia.
- Additional counseling services for at-risk students.
- Supplemental funding for alternative learning centers.
- A multicultural advocacy center.
- Transportation for students and their parents to participate in extracurricular activities.
- Personal computer laboratory.
- "Writing to Read" laboratory.
- At-risk student mentors.
- Homework hotline.
- Accelerated learning center.

In order to discover any common objectives, or purposes, among these various at-risk programs, the district respondents were asked to identify their program according to how it fit into one or more of six descriptive categories provided on the survey instrument. The district respondents could check any number of objectives that were appropriate to their program; thus, the total number of responses in Table 2 exceeds the total number of 36 at-risk targeted programs and the sum of the percentages of programs under each objective exceeds 100 percent.

TABLE 2

SERVICES FOR AT-RISK STUDENTS: PROGRAM OBJECTIVES AND PURPOSES

Objectives and Purposes	Programs
Enhances or enriches an existing social service to assist at-risk students in improving their school-related attitudes and behavior.	16 (44%)
Changes one or more of the district's regular curricula (e.g., mathematics), in order to assist at-risk students academically.	15 (42%)
Staff development and training to assist personnel in understanding and serving at-risk students.	15 (42%)
Activities aimed at increasing involvement and participation of the parents of at-risk students.	13 (36%)
Activities aimed at increasing community awareness, involvement, and/or participation.	13 (36%)
New social services to help at-risk students improve their school-related attitudes and behavior.	11 (31%)

PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

IMPLEMENTATION

The majority of the districts, 73 percent, that reported data on program implementation did, in fact, implement their proposed Chapter 2 programs. Nine districts reported only partial implementation. When asked to explain the reason for partial implementation, two districts reported that a delay in application approval from the state education agency caused delays in fully implementing the program. Two other districts were unable to recruit suitable personnel in time for full implementation. Another two districts stated they had underestimated the funds required for full implementation, and one district determined from its own evaluation that a program needed additional review and revision before receiving funding.

EVALUATION RESOURCES

All school districts receiving Chapter 2 funds were required to conduct program evaluation activities in order to assess the effectiveness of their Chapter 2-sponsored programs. To discover how the sample of the 50 participating districts evaluated their programs, each of the six survey instruments contained an item requesting the districts to indicate the type of data sources they had used to assess the effectiveness of their Chapter 2 programs. According to their responses, districts generally used several data sources to evaluate each program. As was mentioned earlier, some districts had more than one at-risk program in place. The types of data sources and the number of programs for which districts reported their use are provided in Table 3.

TABLE 3

SERVICES FOR AT-RISK STUDENTS: EVALUATION RESOURCES

Data Source	Programs Reporting	
Teacher/staff surveys	27	(75%)
Classroom observations	21	(58%)
Standardized achievement tests	20	(56%)
School records	19	(53%)
Parent surveys	13	(36%)
Locally developed tests	12	(33%)
Student surveys	11	(31%)
Student products	11	(31%)
Other (proprietary tests, scales, etc.)	2	(6%)

While all of the programs reported using some type of data for program assessment, the most frequent types of data sources tended to be more qualitative than quantitative in nature: staff surveys and classroom observations collect data about teachers' perceptions of effectiveness, not about student performance as a measure of program success. Although standardized achievement test data were reported for 20 percent of the programs, information was not provided on how those data actually were used to assess program effectiveness.

OBSERVABLE OUTCOMES

Besides indicating the types of data they used to assess program effectiveness, school districts also were asked to indicate which observable outcomes they could attribute to their Chapter 2 program(s). In order to avoid placing a severe burden upon the sample school districts participating in the study, the districts were instructed not to submit outcome data to the Agency, but to check those outcome categories for which they *could* provide available data as evidence of positive outcomes. Because districts could select any or all of the outcome categories that applied, the data reported in Table 4 represent duplicated program counts; thus, the total number of responses exceeds the number of programs, and the sum of the percentages exceeds 100 percent .

TABLE 4

SERVICES FOR AT-RISK STUDENTS: OBSERVABLE OUTCOMES

Observable Outcomes	Programs	
Improved grades	19	(53%)
Improved teacher interest/awareness of at-risk students' needs	19	(53%)
Improved achievement test scores	18	(50%)
Improved staff interest and awareness of at-risk students' needs	18	(50%)
Improved administrative response to the needs of at-risk students	18	(50%)
Improved classroom participation	17	(47%)
Improved attitudes about school	17	(47%)
Improved attendance	16	(44%)
Improved conduct	15	(42%)
Improved parental involvement/awareness	14	(39%)
Improved use of instructional/educational materials	13	(36%)
Improved promotion rate	13	(36%)
Improved graduation rate	8	(22%)
Improved community involvement/awareness	7	(19%)

PROGRAM BENEFITS

DIRECT BENEFITS

For a Chapter 2 program that provides services to at-risk students, it is reasonable to expect some direct positive outcomes for those students who participated, or were targeted by, that program. School districts were asked, therefore, to provide any information regarding direct student outcomes attributable to their Chapter 2 at-risk program that they already had available. Eighteen of the 24 districts reported data on the numbers of students who showed improvement in five categories: 1) classroom participation, 2) school attendance, 3) discipline , 4) promotion to the next grade, and 5) test grades. Data on direct student impacts are provided in Table 5 on the next page below. The districts could count students in any category in which they showed improvement; thus, Table 5 contains duplicated student counts.

Out of the 24 school districts with programs in this targeted area, 18 districts submitted data that indicated there were direct impacts upon their students who participated in the Chapter 2 programs. Of these 18 districts, all but three provided data in an amount that suggested a rather cautious approach to making claims of direct student benefits. Six districts chose not to provide any student impact data at all. The school districts' caution about attributing direct student benefits to Chapter 2 programs is consistent with the general expectations of Chapter 2-sponsored programs, which were expressed by the U. S. Department of Education in its technical assistance guide to the states for evaluating Chapter 2 program effectiveness.

TABLE 5

SERVICES FOR AT-RISK STUDENTS: IMPACTS UPON STUDENTS

Type of Impact	#Students
Students with improved classroom participation	10,341
Students with improved attendance	10,151
Students with improved discipline	9,313
Students promoted (expected for 1991)	8,927
Students with improved test grades	8,693

Of the possible types of impacts that could have been reported for students, the respondents in the research sample were most likely to report improvements in classroom participation, followed closely by improvements in attendance. It is interesting to note that the outcome category, "improved test grades," had the least number of reported students of the five student impact categories. These findings support the notion that Chapter 2 programs tend to positively impact student behaviors, such as attendance and classroom involvement, more than student academic performance as measured by grades. Improvements in student behaviors are, of course, important positive outcomes for an educational program. Moreover, the improvement in student behaviors reported by the districts in this one-year study represent the type of short-term outcomes one could realistically expect of Chapter 2 supplementary programs. Longer-term student outcomes, such as improvements in grades and test scores over time, may eventually be realized, but were not ascertainable in this effectiveness study.

INDIRECT BENEFITS

Although the survey instrument used in this study consisted almost entirely of closed-ended items, it did include a narrative component to give local Chapter 2 coordinators and project directors an opportunity to describe in their own words the contributions made by Chapter 2 funding to their district. This item occurs on the survey instruments for all six of the targeted assistance areas.

> *"Describe briefly the greatest contribution, or asset, to your district made possible by the existence of Chapter 2 funds."*

The comments to this survey item generally came from the districts' Chapter 2 coordinators, most of whom mentioned two or more benefits derived from their Chapter 2 programs. The written comments were examined to discover any common benefits that were reported by the various Chapter 2 coordinators. Six general categories of reported benefits were discerned from the respondents' narratives and are presented in Table 6.

TABLE 6

SERVICES FOR AT-RISK STUDENTS: BENEFITS OF CHAPTER 2 PROGRAMS

Reported Benefit	Respondents
Allows for expanded services and resources to more students	10
Enhances quality of district resources	7
Enhances quality of service delivery to students	7
Improves faculty and staff skills to help at-risk students	7
Supports innovative/unique programs for students with greatest needs	5
Enhances school/parent/community cooperation	3

The benefit most commonly mentioned was that Chapter 2 supplementary funds, by providing additional materials, instructional programs, and counseling services, improve a district's ability to reach more at-risk students than would be normally possible. Many respondents expanded on this theme, commenting on the benefit of enhanced or improved *quality* of the districts' delivery of services to at-risk students and improved quality of instructional resources which indirectly contribute to improved services. Respondents from the districts with programs that supplemented faculty and staff development reported improved skills for the teachers and counselors who work directly with at-risk students.

Several respondents reported that Chapter 2 funding better enabled them to attempt innovative programs by supplementing the funding of pilot programs, or new and unique programs that specifically target the at-risk student. The Chapter 2 coordinator from Austin Independent School District (ISD), one of the state's six largest urban districts, stated:

> *"...Chapter 2 funding has permitted the district to pilot a number of programs, evaluating them over an adequate period of time, and make solid judgements concerning their effectiveness. Those that have proven effective have been continued, most often with other funding, others have been modified and/or discontinued. Without Chapter 2 funding, these new initiatives could not have been implemented."*

Several Chapter 2 directors of smaller projects that focused on providing services to students mentioned how their program benefited the children, the teachers, and the community. The director of such a project in Katy ISD, a large suburban school district, provided these comments:

> *"The Chapter 2 funds provided for this project have allowed the Katy Independent School District to make a difference in the lives of many students. The S.T.A.R.S. program (Saving the At-Risk Student) provides a climate of success to tap into the abilities of students who would be lost if not for the program. Many of these students' lives have been altered positively by their association with the*

S.T.A.R.S. program. These students, who have been rescued from 'falling through the cracks,' will be better able to serve themselves and the patrons of the district following the successful completion of high school. The dividend of this program will be felt in this community for years to come."

PROGRAM SYNOPSES

In order to obtain specific information about the Chapter 2 programs, districts were requested to submit a "Program Synopsis" for each program with information about project activities, expected outcomes, and perceived benefits. Examination of those synopses resulted in identifying several programs with exemplary objectives and outcomes. Two of these synopses are provided below. Information about program benefits represent the statements provided by the school district's staff. All of the program synopses remain on file at the Texas Education Agency.

TARGETED AREA #1: SERVICES FOR AT-RISK STUDENTS

EXEMPLARY PROGRAM SYNOPSIS #1

Project: Homework Hotline
District: Dallas
Funding: $115,436
Program Scope: District-wide
# Students: 132,000
# Staff 10
Grade Level: Kindergarten - 12

Program Description / Activities Conducted

The Homework Hotline provides after school assistance in completing homework assignments to students in the core content areas of language arts, social studies, science, and mathematics. Although the Hotline targets at-risk students, it is available to all the district's students in the core content areas. The telephone bank is operated by professional career teachers and bilingual communications are offered. Counseling services are provided by school counselors for those students experiencing personal problems and/or need assistance with class planning.

Program Objectives / Outcomes Expected

- Provide training to participating teachers in conducting Hotline activities.
- Provide supplementary assistance to students after school hours in various academic areas.
- Provide students reinforcement, encouragement, and support in completing homework assignments.

Program Benefits

Students and teachers have benefited from the homework hotline program tremendously. Students are better able to complete their homework assignments. As a result, there is an increase in attendance and class participation. Teachers are able to teach more because they spend less time on remediation or helping students with homework during class time.

TARGETED AREA #1: SERVICES FOR AT-RISK STUDENTS

EXEMPLARY PROGRAM SYNOPSIS #2

Project: The Red Flag Project
District: Katy
Funding: $33,310
Program Scope: Campus level
# Students: 139
# Staff: 65
Grade Level: Prekindergarten - 6

Program Description / Activities Conducted

A Red Flag Mentor Case Manager works with at-risk students who have been given a "red flag" status, their teachers, and their parents in an effort to ensure as many positive school experiences for these students as possible. The Mentor Case Manager provides individual and group counseling and instructional sessions. Prescriptions for individual learning are written for each at-risk student. These academic modifications are distributed to each teacher. All students' grades are monitored each three weeks and parent conferences are held as needed. Additional program components include: student mentoring, community involvement, and providing school supplies, school clothing, and personal hygiene facilities to red flag students.

Program Objectives / Outcomes Expected

- Increase in parent communication and involvement.
- Improvement in student academics.
- Decrease in discipline referrals.
- Increase in student participation in extracurricular activities.
- Decrease in retention of students in the program.
- Increase in self-esteem of students in the program.

Program Benefits

All Red Flag students were promoted to the next grade. A special committee, "Parents and Relatives Involved in Directing Educational Success (P.R.I.D.E.S.)," was developed. Discipline referrals were 41 percent lower for 1990-91 than in 1989-90. Comparing the 1990-91 Red Flag students to their 1989-90 school records, 53 percent had grade point averages the same or higher; 65 percent had reading grades the same or higher.

TARGETED AREA #4

"Programs of training and professional development to enhance the knowledge and skills of educational personnel"

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

PROGRAMS: 18 school districts out of the 50 sample districts provided training and professional development through 21 separate programs.

FUNDS EXPENDED: $416,292 were expended by the 18 sample districts.

Statewide, $2,330,861 were expended by public schools in targeted area #4. Funds expended for each program by the 18 sample districts ranged from $185 to $172,399.

NUMBER OF STAFF INVOLVED: 12,050 persons participated in 21 programs.

This figure includes principals, teachers, librarians, administrators, parents, school counselors, and other pupil services personnel. Most of the training recipients were teachers (80 percent), followed by principals and central office administrators, each comprising 8 percent. The remaining 4 percent included counselors, parents, and teacher aides.

PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION:

Implemented and expanded	5	(24%)
Implemented as planned	14	(67%)
Partially implemented	2	(19%)
Total Programs Reporting	21	

PROFILE OF THE SAMPLE DISTRICTS

The distribution of the 18 school districts among the two variables, *average daily attendance* and *percentage of ethnic minority students*, is reported in Table 7.

As the data in Table 7 indicate, staff development and training programs were well distributed among the different district size ("average daily attendance") categories, but were more likely to be found in the districts with a high percentage of minority students.

TABLE 7

TRAINING AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS: DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF DISTRICTS

	Average Daily Attendance							
Percent Minority	**>50,000**	**25,000-49,000**	**10,000-24,999**	**5,000-9,999**	**3,000-4,999**	**1,600-2,999**	**1,000-1,599**	**500-999**
50% & over	3	2	2		1			
30% - 49%		1	1		1			
20% - 29%		1						
10% - 19%		1	1	1		1		
5% - 9%							1	
under 5%								1

TYPES OF PROGRAMS

The sample districts provided professional training mainly through five different delivery methods. The most common training method was the "workshop" with 17 of the 21 programs choosing that format. The second most common format, with 11 programs reporting, was the "inservice course," followed by "conferences" and "independent study," which were used in four programs respectively. The "seminar/lecture" format was used in only three programs. Four other programs reported totally different training methods including consultation, faculty meetings, and a college level course.

For 13 programs, training was provided mainly by district staff. Seven districts in the research sample received all or part of their professional development through their regional Education Service Center (ESC). Less commonly, districts used private consultants, private training companies, and public, nonprofit trainers to provide training and staff development.

When asked to estimate what percentage of its Chapter 2-funded staff development programs was targeted for teachers and counselors who work directly with at-risk students, eight out of the 17 programs that responded estimated 100 percent. The estimates from the remaining nine districts ranged from 75 percent to 3 percent. On the average, 50 percent of the training programs were for staff who worked directly with at-risk students.

A wide variety of professional development activities takes place in the districts, of which many are supplemented by Chapter 2. Consequently, staff training programs vary in their purpose or objectives. The most common training objective among the sample districts, with 15 respondents so indicating, related to "adoption and refinement of instructional techniques." Another five programs had a very similar objective, that of "developing knowledge and application of computer technology for instruction." The second most common objective was "instructional leadership and supervision," followed closely by "implementation of new programs into content areas." Less than half of the training sessions were dedicated to the development of curriculum materials or development of a knowledge base in the subject areas. Thus, educators from the study sample generally used professional development sessions pragmatically to develop and improve their instructional techniques and supervisory skills, rather than to learn more about a subject area.

PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

IMPLEMENTATION

The majority of the training and professional development programs, 19 out of 21, were successfully implemented, and five of these were expanded beyond the districts' original plan. Only two districts reported partial implementation, which one district attributed to receiving the training materials late, and the other district to under-budgeting the cost of the personnel who provided the training.

EVALUATION RESOURCES

Of all the Chapter 2-sponsored programs, staff development and training programs have been the most frequently evaluated. This is due mainly to the fact that staff training sessions have a long history of being evaluated and to the fact that these training sessions lend themselves easily to paper and pencil evaluation instruments. In fact, using questionnaires to survey participants at the conclusion of a training session is the most common evaluation method for staff development programs. In respect to the 18 districts in our research sample, all but one district reported using some form of paper questionnaire form.

Districts that provided professional development with their own personnel used survey instruments that were unique to them. Districts that received staff training and professional development programs through their regional service center relied on the Education Service Center staff to evaluate those programs. The regional service centers used a standard questionnaire that was administered to participants of all their diverse training programs.

As the data in Table 8 show, districts used other methods in addition to questionnaires for measuring training program effectiveness. These methods included classroom observations (11 programs), participant interviews (8 programs), and surveys of students whose teachers received training (2 programs). For one program that provided training for teacher aides to prepare them for acquiring a teacher certificate, effectiveness was established by the fact that all the participants successfully earned their certificates and became qualified to teach in their home district. Because school districts often used more than one type of evaluation method, Table 8 contains duplicate counts of the 21 programs and, consequently, the sum of the percentages of districts using each method exceeds 100 percent.

TABLE 8

TRAINING AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS: EVALUATION RESOURCES

Data Source	Programs
Participant surveys	20 (95%)
Classroom observations	11 (52%)
Participant interviews	8 (38%)
Student surveys	2 (10%)
Other (teacher certificate earned)	1 (5%)

OBSERVABLE OUTCOMES: FACULTY AND STAFF

As can be seen from the data in Table 8, staff training and professional development programs were evaluated almost universally through paper and pencil survey questionnaires. The type of evaluation that occurs through questionnaire surveys tends to be purely formative, that is, the evaluation assesses the quality of the program as perceived by trainees. Exactly what elements of program quality the questionnaire asks of trainees varies from one survey instrument to the next. In general, questionnaires are used to inquire about the trainers' skill at presenting the programs and about the session's perceived success in terms of providing information and techniques deemed timely, useful, and relevant for the trainees' job performance.

Because many districts already had staff development evaluation forms and methods in place, and in the interest of efficiency, districts participating in the effectiveness study had the option to provide results from their own survey instrument, along with a copy of the instrument, or use a brief survey developed by the Agency specifically for the Chapter 2 study. Eleven out of 18 school districts opted to use the Agency's survey instrument. The results from the Agency survey are discussed in the next section.

Most of the remaining districts provided summary information from their own survey instrument. Because wide differences existed among the unique district surveys, in terms of both format and quality of information that was provided, no generalizations from those surveys were attempted. However, in order to give all of the districts an opportunity to convey information about their programs' effectiveness, they were requested to select from a list of six staff development outcomes those for which they had evidence.

The districts' responses are provided below in Table 9. Because districts could select any number of outcomes, Table 9 contains duplicate counts of the 21 programs and, consequently, the percentages of programs that reported a specific outcome do not sum to 100 percent.

TABLE 9

TRAINING AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS: OBSERVABLE OUTCOMES - FACULTY AND STAFF

Observable Outcomes	Programs
Staff learned what was presented.	15 (71%)
Staff applied new knowledge in their position.	13 (62%)
Staff indicated sessions were relevant to their work.	12 (57%)
Staff demonstrated increases in knowledge and/or skills.	10 (48%)
Staff demonstrated increased awareness of at-risk students' needs.	10 (48%)
Staff demonstrated improved attitudes.	10 (48%)

OBSERVABLE OUTCOMES: STUDENTS

If teachers show professional improvements, then it may be expected that such improvement will have some type of positive impact upon their students. This potential impact upon training recipients' students is the indirect outcome of professional development programs. Student outcomes are considered indirect because the connection between improvement in a teacher's professional knowledge and improvement among the teacher's students is not directly causal. Nevertheless, some type of changes in students can reasonably be expected when teachers apply their new knowledge and skills. In fact, student outcomes are often used as a barometer of teacher training effectiveness especially when that training has been an integral part of efforts to improve student academic performance.

It is beyond the scope of this evaluation study to assess Chapter 2 staff development program effectiveness through measures of student outcomes. From discussions during the site visits, however, it was clear that the Chapter 2 coordinators in districts with professional development programs believed that those programs did have positive impacts upon their students. Consequently, Chapter 2 coordinators and directors were given an opportunity in this effectiveness study to present information about student outcomes that they perceived could be attributed, at least indirectly, to their professional development and training programs.

In order to collect indirect student outcome data, an item was included in the Agency survey that asked district respondents to indicate from a list of possible student outcomes those which they believed could be attributed, at least in part, to Chapter 2-sponsored professional development programs. The respondents' answers are presented in Table 10 below. Respondents could indicate any possible outcome that applied, so the total responses exceeds the number of programs and the percentages do not sum to 100 percent.

TABLE 10

TRAINING AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS: OBSERVABLE OUTCOMES - STUDENTS

Student Outcomes	Programs
Improved grades/test scores	14 (67%)
Improved classroom participation	9 (43%)
Improved attitudes about school	8 (38%)
Improved conduct	6 (29%)
Improved attendance	3 (14%)

PROGRAM BENEFITS

RESULTS OF THE TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY SURVEY FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

In addition to the main survey instrument for collecting evaluation information about their Chapter 2 programs, the 18 school districts with training and development programs were provided a second questionnaire, along with instructions, to be administered to their staff who attended Chapter 2-sponsored training sessions. The session participant questionnaire was developed specifically for this Chapter 2 evaluation study. Districts were instructed to use the questionnaire if they did not have training program effectiveness data for school year 1990-91 already available which could be submitted to the Agency. Eleven out of the 18 school districts submitted data to the Agency based on this participant questionnaire. (The questionnaire is included in the report in Appendix C.)

The questionnaire contained five questions that asked training session participants about their perceptions of the effectiveness of those sessions. The respondents were instructed to indicate the extent to which their training session had accomplished the following objectives:

1) Provided information or skills training that had practical application to their work.
2) Provided knowledge and skills that had been implemented on the job.
3) Contributed to improvement in the instructional program.
4) Contributed to improvement in students' academic performance.
5) Contributed to improvement in students' behavior or attitudes.

For each question, the respondents could select only one option from the following scale:

> **1** - Not at all. **2** - A small amount. **3** - A moderate amount. **4** - A great deal.
> **NA** (not applicable).

For each of the five program objectives, an average score (arithmetic mean) was calculated from the responses from all 11 districts. The higher the mean score for each program objective, (e.g., 3.9), then the *greater the extent* the program was perceived to have accomplished that objective. The average score and standard deviation for each objective listed in the questionnaire are provided in Table 11.

As the data in Table 11 below indicate, objective #1 received the highest average score of 3.7; in general, the respondents were most positive about the extent to which the training session provided them with information or skills that had practical application to their work. Items #2 and #5 had closely similar scores of 3.43 and 3.41 respectively, indicating that the program had, to a slightly more than a moderate extent, provided knowledge and skills that were implemented on the job and contributed to improvement in students' behavior or attitudes. All of the items, in fact, had very similar high scores with 3.37 for Item #4 and 3.27 for Item #3, which indicates that, as a group, the respondents perceived that their training sessions made contributions to improving students' academic performance and to improving the instructional program.

TABLE 11

TRAINING AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS: REPORTED PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

Survey Item	Average Score	Standard Deviation
#1. Provided information or skills training that had practical application to their work.	3.65	.30
#2. Provided knowledge and skills that had been implemented on the job.	3.43	.36
#5. Contributed to improvement in students' behavior or attitudes.	3.41	.47
#4. Contributed to improvement in students' academic performance.	3.37	.47
#3. Contributed to improvement in the instructional program.	3.27	.42

INDIRECT BENEFITS

> *"Describe briefly the greatest contribution, or asset, to your district made possible by the existence of Chapter 2 funds."*

Answers to the open-ended narrative item about Chapter 2's contribution to the districts were rather sparse when compared to the comments made by respondents in the other targeted areas. The most common remark was that Chapter 2 provided staff training sessions that otherwise would not have been available. As the coordinator from Plano ISD, a large suburban school district, indicated:

> *"With a staff of 1500+ professionals, local funds do not provide as much training as needed, particularly for special program emphasis. The Chapter 2 funds give the district an opportunity to offer a wider selection of courses for teachers. As teachers become more familiar with different techniques, the climate for student learning improves."*

That Chapter 2 provides for training not otherwise attainable was especially true for one rural district, Paradise ISD, whose Chapter 2 coordinator commented:

> *"Since we are in a rural Texas location, Chapter 2 funding has made this workshop (Workshop Way) possible in a location that people in two counties were able to attend."*

In general, in the area of training and professional development, Chapter 2 funding accomplished exactly what it was supposed to; it supplemented and enhanced existing training and professional development programs at the district level.

In order to obtain specific information about each program, districts submitted a "Program Synopsis" that described project activities, expected outcomes, and perceived benefits. Two synopses for programs that were considered exemplary are provided on the pages that follow . Program synopses for all of the training and professional development programs remain on file at the Texas Education Agency.

TARGETED AREA #4: TRAINING AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

SYNOPSIS OF EXEMPLARY PROGRAM #1

Program: School Improvement Process
District: Sanford-Fritch ISD
Funding: $5,674
Program Scope: District-wide
# Students: All
# Staff: 91
Grade Levels: Kindergarten - 12

Program Description / Activities Conducted

Three inservice training sessions were conducted: 1) "The Joy of Achievement," 2) "High Expectations," and 3) "Learning Styles."

Two workshops were conducted: "Orientation to Effective Schools" and "The School Improvement Process."

A "Reading Improvement" conference was conducted for teachers to learn more about independent study with available resources.

Program Objectives / Outcomes Expected

- To familiarize participants with the joy of achievement which can be attained by communicating higher expectations of students.
- Teachers will learn to communicate specific motivating and supportive teacher-student interactions which convey high expectations and influence student achievement.
- Teachers will investigate how knowledge and application of learning styles theory can impact and improve student performance.
- Teachers will become aware of common language and beliefs of "Effective Schools" prior to initiating the district's School Improvement Process.
- Instructional leaders will receive training in the stages of the School Improvement Process to implement later at individual campuses.
- Teachers will study trends and practices in reading instruction and will apply new techniques/strategies in the classroom.

Program Benefits

Students benefited because of improved instruction resulting from staff development. Evidence of accomplishment was observed at Fritch Elementary where extensive training of a teacher working with at-risk students resulted in excellent achievement test score gains by the students in the program at grade levels one, two, and three.

TARGETED AREA #4: TRAINING AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

SYNOPSIS OF EXEMPLARY PROGRAM #2

Program:	Staff Development/At-Risk Program
District:	Killeen ISD
Funding:	$21,000
Program Scope:	District-wide
# Students:	2,000
# Staff:	60
Grade Levels:	6 - 12

Program Description / Activities Conducted

Staff development included:

1) An effective skills development program written by the district to help students make a smooth academic transition between grade and developmental levels.

2) QUEST Skills for Adolescents.

3) Peer facilitators.

4) Training on how to more effectively serve at-risk students.

The QUEST training was provided through QUEST International to a select group of teachers and counselors. The effective skills development program was presented to all middle school teachers.

Program Objectives / Outcomes Expected

- To increase awareness among teachers of students who may be at-risk.
- To better serve at-risk students through curriculum modifications and special programs.

Program Benefits

The various programs have allowed for curriculum revisions in order to better serve at-risk students. Evaluation evidence indicated:

- Greater parental and teacher involvement in the at-risk program.
- Improved study and test-taking skills of students.
- Improved relationships among students and teachers.

TARGETED AREA #3

"Innovative Programs Designed to Carry Out Schoolwide Improvements Including the Effective Schools Program"

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

PROGRAMS: Eight out of the 50 sample school districts conducted 16 schoolwide improvement programs in this targeted area.

FUNDS EXPENDED: $594,587 were expended by the eight school districts.

Statewide, $2,240,477 were expended by public school districts in targeted area #3. Funds for each program in the eight school districts ranged from $282 to $110,939.

NUMBER OF STUDENTS SERVED: 353,121 in the eight sample districts.

NUMBER OF STAFF INVOLVED: 2,332 in the eight sample districts.

This figure includes faculty, counselors, and administrative staff in the eight districts who participated in Chapter 2 programs to carry out schoolwide improvements including effective schools programs.

PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION:	Implemented and expanded	1	(6%)
	Implemented as planned	12	(75%)
	Partially implemented	3	(19%)
	Total Programs Reporting	16	

PROFILE OF THE SAMPLE DISTRICTS

The distribution of the eight school districts along the two demographic variables, *average daily attendance*, and *percentage of ethnic minority students*, is reported in Table 12.

TABLE 12

SCHOOLWIDE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS: DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF DISTRICTS

	Average Daily Attendance					
Percent Minority	> 50,000	25,000-49,000	10,000-24,999	5,000-9,999	3,000-5,000	1,600-2,999
50% & over	1				2	
30% - 49%		1	1		1	
10% - 19%				1		1

TYPES OF PROGRAMS

Programs under this targeted assistance area, although few in number, were very broad in scope and widely diverse. Districts with programs under this targeted area referred to them as "effective schools" programs, although most of those programs actually represented schoolwide improvement programs that did not strictly fall under the label of "effective schools" as described in the Chapter 2 statutes. The schoolwide improvement programs in the eight sample districts included projects such as:

- An instructional program utilizing an interactive television system.
- An instructional leadership training program for teachers.
- A parent partnership program.
- Supplemental special equipment giving students electronic information access in order to conduct original research work.
- Enhancement of a learning center for elementary students to improve their listening skills.
- A language arts computer writing laboratory.

PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

EVALUATION RESOURCES

School districts were responsible for evaluating their Chapter 2 programs, as previously noted, using methods of their own choice. The types of evaluation resources the eight districts reported using to evaluate their effective schools programs are provided in Table 13. Since districts generally used several types of evaluation resources, the number of programs reporting are duplicated counts which means the sum of the percentages exceeds 100 percent.

TABLE 13

SCHOOLWIDE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS: EVALUATION RESOURCES

Data Source	Programs Reporting	
Teacher/staff surveys	7	(41%)
Classroom observations	6	(35%)
School records	6	(35%)
Standardized achievement tests	4	(24%)
Locally developed tests	2	(12%)
Other (proprietary tests, scales, etc.)	1	(6%)

School districts relied most frequently on staff surveys and classroom observations to collect data about program effectiveness. School district staff did not analyze these data to determine the nature of any impacts upon students, but they did believe that positive student outcomes occurred. The evidence they reported are discussed below.

OBSERVABLE OUTCOMES

School districts implement "schoolwide improvement" programs in order to benefit most if not all students at a particular school. Thus, direct impacts upon any particular group of students are not necessarily to be expected from a schoolwide improvement program. When asked to indicate program effectiveness, however, districts in this study indicated several positive student outcomes had been observed. The school districts' responses regarding these observable outcomes are presented in Table 14.

TABLE 14

SCHOOLWIDE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS: OBSERVABLE OUTCOMES

Observable Outcomes	Programs Reporting	
Improved use of instructional materials	12	(72%)
Improved student attitudes	10	(60%)
Improved classroom participation	9	(54%)
Improved conduct	5	(30%)
Improved grades	4	(24%)
Improved achievement test scores	2	(12%)
Improved attendance	2	(12%)
Improved district services/delivery	2	(12%)
Improved promotion rate	1	(6%)
Improved graduation rate	1	(6%)
Other	4	(24%)

PROGRAM BENEFITS

CONTRIBUTIONS TO DISTRICTS' SCHOOLWIDE IMPROVEMENT PLANS: TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY SURVEY FINDINGS

A school district that used Chapter 2 funds to address targeted area number three did so in order to supplement and enhance activities associated with its existing campus improvement plan, a plan which, beginning in the 1990-91 school year, was required of all Texas public school districts. To discover if a Chapter 2-sponsored schoolwide improvement program had successfully helped a district accomplish its campus improvement goals, an additional questionnaire was included in that district's package of evaluation materials for this study. The districts were instructed to administer this additional survey instrument to a sample of their faculty and staff who actively participated in the Chapter 2 schoolwide improvement program.

Respondents to the questionnaire were instructed to indicate their perception of *the extent to which* their Chapter 2-sponsored program contributed to each of 13 generally accepted components of "effective schools." These effective schools components were selected as survey items because they are the standard building blocks of schoolwide improvement plans. The respondents used the following scale to indicate their answers to the 13 survey items: **1** - No contribution; **2** - A small contribution; **3** - A moderate contribution; **4** - A great contribution; **NA** - Not applicable, or no opinion. The average scores for each item are reported in Table 15.

TABLE 15

SCHOOLWIDE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS: CHAPTER 2 CONTRIBUTION TO DISTRICTS' SCHOOLWIDE IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Effective Schools Component	Average Score
Instructional improvement	3.4
Increasing academic achievement of at-risk students	3.3
A climate of high expectations for students	3.3
Emphasis on acquiring basic and higher order skills	3.3
A safe and orderly school environment	3.2
Increasing academic achievement of all students	3.1
Staff development	3.1
Effective instructional leadership	2.8
School-level planning	2.7
Organizational capacity for instructional problem solving	2.7
Programs to evaluate effects of instructional programs	2.7
Continuous/effective assessment of students	2.5
Parent and community involvement	2.2

The average score (arithmetic mean) was calculated for each of the 13 questionnaire items and interpreted such that the higher the average score (e.g., 3.9) the greater the Chapter 2 program's perceived contribution to helping the district achieve the effective school components of the schoolwide improvement plan. The *mean* ratings for the effective school components ranged from 3.4 for "instructional improvement" to 2.2 for "parental involvement." The *median* score, which represents a mid-point average for the combined scores of the effective school components, was 3.1, which indicates that respondents believed their Chapter 2 programs made mostly a "moderate" to a "great" contribution to their districts' schoolwide improvement plan. Four effective school components that relate directly to students and their learning environment received the highest average scores. These components are:

1. Instructional improvement - 3.4
2. Increasing academic achievement of at-risk students - 3.3
3. A climate of high expectations for students - 3.3
4. Emphasis on acquiring basic and higher order skills - 3.3.

Three effective school components that relate to issues other than student learning received lower mean ratings: a) school organization, b) student assessment, and c) community issues. Nevertheless, these three components were still perceived as being impacted positively by the Chapter 2 program.

INDIRECT BENEFITS

> *"Describe briefly the greatest contribution, or asset, to your district made possible by the existence of Chapter 2 funds."*

Responses to the narrative item about Chapter 2's specific contribution to the district were analyzed to identify any common benefits. These data are reported in Table 16.

TABLE 16

SCHOOLWIDE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS: INDIRECT BENEFITS

Benefit	# Programs
Expanded resources and services	12
Improved student attitudes	6
Improved student creativity/thinking skills	6
Improved teachers skills	4
Improved student academic performance	2

Respondents mentioned benefits due to expanding both educational resources and services to students. For faculty and staff in the eight sample districts, those expansions meant they were able to apply new education technology to help accomplish some of the effective schools' components. In fact, most of the schoolwide improvement programs entailed acquiring either computers, or computer-related technology for improving effective administrative and instructional leadership, improving instruction, and enhancing assessment of students and programs to evaluate the effects of instruction. The benefits to students and staff that resulted included: a) increased teacher effectiveness, b) improved student attitudes, and c) improved student writing and thinking skills.

In order to obtain specific information about each program, districts submitted a "Program Synopsis" for each program that described project activities, expected outcomes, and program benefits. Examination of those synopses resulted in identifying at least two programs with exemplary objectives and outcomes; their synopses are provided below. All program synopses remain on file at the Texas Education Agency.

TARGETED AREA #3: SCHOOLWIDE IMPROVEMENTS INCLUDING EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS

SYNOPSIS OF EXEMPLARY PROGRAM #1

Project:	Assessment of Elementary Mathematics Skills
District:	Brazosport
Funding:	$18,000
Program Scope:	District-wide
# Students:	6,000
# Staff:	350
Grade Levels:	Kindergarten-5

Program Description / Activities Conducted

Chapter 2 funds were provided for supplementary testing for mastery/non-mastery of elementary mathematics learning objectives for students in kindergarten through grade five. This project addresses the effective school component of "continuous assessment of students and programs to evaluate the effects of instruction." The scores of students' mathematics tests were provided to teachers at the individual and classroom level. Test scores aggregated at the classroom and grade level were provided to principals. Statistical analysis of mathematics tests were compiled at the district level to assess students' mastery of individual mathematics objectives. The results of all the data compilations proved useful for program evaluation and educational diagnostic purposes.

Program Objectives / Outcomes Expected

- Teachers will be provided with current data on mastery/non-mastery of math objectives for individual students and at the classroom level.
- Principals will be provided with current data on mastery/non-mastery of math objectives at the classroom and grade level.
- District staff will be provided with analysis of current data on mastery/non-mastery of math objectives at the campus and district level.

Program Benefits

Analysis of information collected from teachers through a survey indicated that the teachers viewed having data on their students' progress in acquiring mastery of mathematics as very positive and supportive of their instructional objectives. The teachers stated this information assisted them in identifying student deficiencies in mathematics and in holding conferences with parents. Teachers also reported that these supplementary efforts to help their students master mathematics had resulted in improved discipline and more positive self-concepts among their students.

TARGETED AREA #3: SCHOOLWIDE IMPROVEMENTS INCLUDING EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS

SYNOPSIS OF EXEMPLARY PROGRAM #2

Project: English Language Arts Computer Writing Lab
District: Pasadena
Funding: $46,000
Program Scope: District-wide
# Students: 8,558
# Staff: 82
Grade Levels: 9-12

Program Description / Activities Conducted

The English Language Arts Computer Writing Lab was set up as a separate but vital part of the English department in each of Pasadena's four high schools. Each lab is equipped with one large computer, 30 personal computers, and one printer. Two software packages are used; one for word processing and one for evaluation of language writing activity. A full-time aide is in each lab for technical support. Both students and teachers have access to the computers. Most of the lab activity is directed toward improving writing skills and productivity.

Program Objectives / Outcomes Expected

- Students will improve their writing ability.
- Students will increase their knowledge of resources available to them in using technology for greater creativity and productivity in writing.
- Students' writing improvement will be demonstrated via improved writing scores on the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills examination.

Program Benefits

The lab has been effective in creating an increase in student writing by giving another dimension other than pen and paper for creating original compositions. The lab has helped make what was once a tedious task for many students a more efficient and pleasurable one. Students are enthusiastic and encouraged to write when they see their work on the printed page. Improved writing scores on the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills test is evidence of the progress made by students in the high school program.

TARGETED AREA #5

"Programs designed to enhance personal excellence of students and student achievement"

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

PROGRAMS: Nine of the 50 sample school districts conducted programs in this targeted assistance area.

FUNDS EXPENDED: $286,138 were expended by the nine districts.

Statewide, $949,298 were expended by public schools for personal excellence programs. Funds expended on each of the nine programs ranged from $7,600 to $106,250.

NUMBER OF STUDENTS SERVED: 33,304 in the nine school districts.

NUMBER OF STAFF INVOLVED: 944 staff persons in the nine school districts.

This figure includes principals, teachers, librarians, administrators, parents, school counselors, and other pupil services personnel.

PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION:	Implemented and expanded	1
	Implemented as planned	6
	Partially implemented	2
	Total Programs Reporting	9

PROFILE OF THE SAMPLE DISTRICTS

The distribution of the nine school districts along the two demographic variables, *average daily attendance*, and *percentage of ethnic minority students*, is reported in Table 17.

TABLE 17

PROGRAMS ENHANCING PERSONAL EXCELLENCE: DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF DISTRICTS

	Average Daily Attendance					
Percent Minority	> 50,000	25,000-49,000	10,000-24,999	5,000-9,999	3,000-5,000	1,600-2,999
50% & over	2	1	2			
30% - 49%			1	1	1	
20% - 29%						
10% - 19%						1

TYPES OF PROGRAMS

The language of Chapter 2 law states that programs under this targeted area may include *"instruction in ethics, performing and creative arts, humanities, activities in physical fitness and comprehensive health education, and participation in community service projects."* The broad mandates for this targeted area, therefore, gave school districts great flexibility to attempt novel programs that could go far beyond the standard curriculum. The school districts with programs in this targeted area conducted widely diverse projects as the following list indicates:

- Artist-in-Education - an artist residency program to provide special classes.
- Higher-level-thinking program for eighth grade mathematics.
- Higher-order-thinking skills program for students in grades 3 and 4.
- Magnet School Curriculum Writing Program.
- Educational theatre.
- Band and orchestra program for middle school students.
- Young Scholars program to supplement the gifted/talented program for elementary and middle school students.
- Scholars' Academy and Writer's Camp.
- Program to train staff in human relations skills to raise self esteem of students in grades 4-8.

PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

EVALUATION RESOURCES

The data sources districts used to evaluate their Personal Excellence programs are reported in Table 18. Consistent with their counterparts who conducted programs in the other targeted assistance areas, program directors of Chapter 2 programs to enhance the personal excellence of their students relied most frequently on staff surveys and classroom observations to collect program effectiveness data. Project directors could check any number of objectives that were appropriate to their program; thus, the total number of responses in Table 18 exceeds the total number of nine personal excellence programs reported in this study.

TABLE 18

PROGRAMS ENHANCING PERSONAL EXCELLENCE: EVALUATION RESOURCES

Data Source	Programs
Teacher/staff surveys	8
Classroom observations	7
School records	4
Student products	3
Parent surveys	3
Standardized achievement tests	2
Student surveys	2
Other (practice tests, etc.)	2

OBSERVABLE OUTCOMES

In regard to data that indicate observable outcomes of their programs, six of the nine districts reported that such data were available. The number of programs with data for the various outcome categories are provided in Table 19 below.

TABLE 19

PROGRAMS ENHANCING PERSONAL EXCELLENCE: OBSERVABLE OUTCOMES

Observable Outcomes	# Programs
Improved use of instructional/educational materials	6
Improved classroom participation	6
Improved attitudes about school	4
Improved achievement test scores	4
Improved grades	3
Improved attendance	3
Improved conduct	3
Improved promotion rate	2
Improved graduation rate	2

PROGRAM BENEFITS

INDIRECT BENEFITS

Chapter 2 coordinators were asked to provide any evidence of direct impacts to students who participated in, or were targeted by, personal excellence programs if their districts had data already available. None of the nine districts were able to provide such data. Consequently, only information about indirect benefits of personal excellence programs, as reported in the narrative component of the study, are provided in this report.

> *"Describe briefly the greatest contribution, or asset, to your district made possible by the existence of Chapter 2 funds."*

Because there were so few programs under this targeted area, rather than combine the responses into common themes, the comments were condensed and listed below.

> New instructional methods and techniques were implemented.
>
> The opportunity was provided to test new programs on one campus before replicating them on other campuses.
>
> The district was able to provide an enrichment experience for students.
>
> Counseling services were expanded to assist more students.
>
> New equipment (musical instruments) provided students novel experiences.
>
> Students participated in new programs that gave them new skills in writing and critical thinking.
>
> Teachers developed new skills for dealing with at-risk students.

Each district with a personal excellence program submitted a "Program Synopsis" which described project activities, expected outcomes, and perceived benefits. The synopses of two programs that appeared to be rather exemplary are provided below. Program synopses for all of the personal excellence programs remain on file at the Texas Education Agency.

TARGETED AREA #5: PROGRAMS ENHANCING PERSONAL EXCELLENCE

SYNOPSIS OF EXEMPLARY PROGRAM #1

Project: Artist-in-Education
District: San Antonio
Funding: $106,250
Program Scope: District-wide
# Students: 11,403
# Staff: 9
Grade Levels: All

Program Description / Activities Conducted

Nine professional artists worked directly with students for 20 hours per week upon request by a campus. Artists' residencies are from four to eight weeks at elementary, middle, and high school levels. The areas of instruction included poetry, music, folkloric dance, creative writing, and the visual arts.

Program Objectives / Outcomes Expected

- Students will increase their knowledge of artistic endeavors.
- Students will increase their appreciation of various art forms.
- Students will develop new artistic skills in an area they choose.

Program Benefits

The arts in the classroom program became a welcomed gift by the students, parents, faculty, and staff because it integrated the creativity of the students with higher order thinking skills. The program enhanced the students' personal development and provided important enrichment activities that otherwise would not have been possible.

(A more detailed report on this project , along with photographic slides, was prepared by San Antonio Independent School District and is available through the Division of Policy Planning and Evaluation at Texas Education Agency.)

TARGETED AREA #5: PROGRAMS ENHANCING PERSONAL EXCELLENCE

SYNOPSIS OF EXEMPLARY PROGRAM #2

Project: Scholars' Academy/Writers' Camp
District: Texas City
Funding: $12,250
Program Scope: District-wide
# Students: 219
# Staff: 28
Grade Levels: 3-12

Program Description / Activities Conducted

High school students attended a Scholars' Academy at the University of Houston where they studied philosophy, logic, leadership training, vocabulary development, word attack skills, test taking strategies, analytical reading, writing, and Scholastic Aptitude Test math/verbal preparation. Students (190) in grades 3-12 attended the district's Writers' Camp. Each student engaged in creative writing and two daily general sessions where writers read their work to their peers. Students attended presentations by a storyteller, an artist, and a drama coach and a dramatization of Rudyard Kipling's "Rikki Tikki Tavi" at the Stage Repertory Theater in Houston, Texas.

Program Objectives / Outcomes Expected

Scholars' Academy:
- Expand critical thinking skills repertory.
- Practice becoming a productive member of a group.
- Recognize and develop the qualities of a successful leader.
- Become more motivated to attend college.
- Improve test taking abilities.

Writers' Camp:
- Develop both creative and expository writing skills.
- Discuss writing with experienced authors.
- Review and follow copyright and submission processes.
- Utilize the computer/word processor as a writing tool.
- Present his/her work before an audience.

Program Benefits

Students in the Scholars' Academy had a positive exposure to a scholastic environment that influenced them in making a commitment to academic achievement. They learned to work as team members and to respect the leadership abilities of themselves and others. Writers' Camp students increased their interest and confidence in their writing abilities and improved their writing skills. Staff who participated learned to work with students and faculty in a partnership environment.

TARGETED AREA #6

"Innovative projects which would enhance the educational program and climate of the school"

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

PROGRAMS: 22 school districts out of the 50 sample districts conducted 25 programs in the "innovative projects" targeted area.

FUNDS EXPENDED: $2,236,952 were expended by the 22 districts.

Statewide, $4,054,499 were expended by public schools in this targeted area. Funds expended by the sample districts on each innovative project ranged from $2,500 to $284,167.

NUMBER OF STUDENTS SERVED: 327,857 students in the 22 sample districts.

NUMBER OF STAFF INVOLVED: 1,403 staff in the 22 sample districts.

This figure includes teachers, librarians, school counselors, and other pupil services personnel and administrators who participated in Chapter 2 innovative projects.

PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION:

Implemented and expanded	5	(20%)
Implemented as planned	19	(76%)
Partially implemented	1	(4%)
Total Programs Reporting	25	

PROFILE OF THE SAMPLE DISTRICTS

The distribution of the 22 school districts along the two demographic variables, *average daily attendance* and *percentage of ethnic minority students*, is reported in Table 20. According to the demographic data, five of the six largest urban school districts had innovative projects. These districts also had 50 percent or more of their students of ethnic minority status. Altogether, 13 (59 percent) of the 22 districts fell into the highest "Percent Ethnic Minority" category of "50% & over." Four of the 22 districts were small school districts with fewer than 5,000 students and one of those had fewer than 1,000 students.

TABLE 20

INNOVATIVE PROJECTS: DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF DISTRICTS

	Average Daily Attendance					
Percent Minority	> 50,000	25,000-49,000	10,000-24,999	5,000-9,999	3,000-5,000	500-999
50% & over	5	2	2	1	2	
30% - 49%		1	2		1	1
20% - 29%		1	1	1		
10% - 19%			1	1		

TYPES OF PROGRAMS

Among the various 25 innovative projects conducted by the 22 districts in the study sample, several targeted on expanding or enriching programs for students identified as gifted or talented. The primary means for expanding or enriching the gifted and talented programs was through new educational technology such as personal computers and videodisc players. A partial listing of the 25 projects is provided below to illustrate their variety:

- Supplemental support of an "Enterprise City" to serve as a full-scale model of a free enterprise economics unit.
- Expanded prekindergarten programs for low-achieving and limited-English-proficient students.
- Computer assisted instructional program for gifted students in prekindergarten through grade five.
- Computer instructional program where students used special data bases to conduct individual research projects.
- Expanded bus services to transport low-income students and parents to school-based multicultural and community events.
- Prekindergarten and kindergarten "Parent Involvement Program."
- Supplemental educational technology to expand creative writing and marine science instructional programs.
- "Science Demonstration" and a "Living Materials Center" program.
- Support of an Instructional Television (ITV) program - a video network for broadcasts of public television and district-produced educational programs.
- "Project Think" - Expanded program for gifted and talented students in grades 1-3.
- Summer school scholarships for at-risk students.
- An "Artists-in-Residence" program.
- A "Cultural Fair" planned and organized by English classes in grades 7-12.

PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

EVALUATION RESOURCES

As in the other targeted areas, districts with innovative projects were required to conduct local evaluations of program effectiveness. The types of evaluation resources used by the 22 districts to evaluate the 25 innovative projects are reported in Table 21.

TABLE 21

INNOVATIVE PROJECTS: EVALUATION RESOURCES

Data Source	Projects Reporting	
Teacher/staff surveys	20	(80%)
Classroom observations	17	(68%)
School records	10	(40%)
Student products	10	(40%)
Standardized achievement tests	9	(36%)
Parent surveys	7	(28%)
Locally developed tests	7	(28%)
Student surveys	6	(24%)
Other (proprietary tests, scales, etc.)	6	(24%)

Consistent with their counterparts in other Chapter 2 programs, district personnel who conducted "innovative projects" relied most frequently on staff surveys and classroom observations to collect program effectiveness data.

OBSERVABLE OUTCOMES

In regard to indicating which observable outcomes they could attribute to their Chapter 2-sponsored innovative projects, the 22 districts checked those outcome categories for which they *could* provide available data as evidence of positive outcomes. Because any of the outcome categories that applied to a project could be checked, the data on observable outcomes presented in Table 22 are duplicated counts; the total number of responses exceeds the total number of projects, and the sum of the percentages exceeds 100 percent.

Also consistent with the data for the other targeted areas, the most commonly reported student outcome was "improved classroom participation." More than half of the respondents also reported "improved conduct" and "improved attendance" as positive outcomes. Slightly less than half (48 percent) of the respondents reported "improved grades" as an observable outcome, a conservative estimate which should be expected from programs that fall under this targeted area.

TABLE 22

INNOVATIVE PROJECTS: OBSERVABLE OUTCOMES

Observable Outcomes	Projects	
Improved classroom participation	18	(72%)
Improved conduct	14	(56%)
Improved attendance	13	(52%)
Improved use of instructional/educational materials	12	(48%)
Improved attitudes about school	12	(48%)
Improved grades	12	(48%)
Improved achievement test scores	7	(28%)
Improved promotion rate	5	(20%)
Improved graduation rate	3	(12%)

PROGRAM BENEFITS

DIRECT BENEFITS

Seven out of the 22 districts provided data to indicate direct impacts of their Chapter 2 innovative projects upon participating students; five of these districts provided very conservative numbers. The caution in attributing direct benefits to Chapter 2 innovative projects is consistent with the findings for the other targeted assistance areas as previously discussed.

TABLE 23

INNOVATIVE PROJECTS: IMPACTS ON STUDENTS

Impact	# Students
Students with improved classroom participation	4,115
Students with improved attitudes	4,070
Students with improved discipline	3,388
Students with improved attendance	2,660
Students with improved test grades	2,627

The sparseness of data can be attributed to several facts: only six of the 25 innovative projects were operated at the campus level where direct student impacts could reasonably be expected; Chapter 2 programs provide supplemental enrichment, thus they are not designed to impact students directly; the objective of several innovative projects was teacher development rather than student improvement. In spite of these limits of innovative projects to create direct impacts, seven districts did feel justified in providing data. While most of the school districts recognized the difficulty in claiming direct benefits to students from their "innovative projects," all of the districts identified numerous indirect benefits or impacts, which are discussed in the next section.

INDIRECT BENEFITS

The Chapter 2 coordinators, or other appropriate district representative, were asked to describe the contributions of their innovative projects by addressing the narrative component on the survey instrument.

> *"Describe briefly the greatest contribution, or asset, to your district made possible by the existence of Chapter 2 funds."*

The common benefits identified from the respondents' comments fell into five general categories as seen in Table 24 below.

TABLE 24

INNOVATIVE PROJECTS: INDIRECT BENEFITS

Type of Benefit	Projects
Expanded resources and services	12 (48%)
Improved Student Attitudes	6 (24%)
Improved Student Creativity/Thinking Skills	6 (24%)
Improved Teachers skills	4 (16%)
Improved student academic performance	2 (8%)

As was the case for the at-risk" targeted area, the most common benefit reported for innovative projects is that they expand the district's existing resources which results in serving more students including special populations of students who tend to need innovative programs if they are to succeed in school. Most of the districts whose innovative projects entailed expanding their instructional resources, used Chapter 2 funds to obtain supplemental education technology such as personal computers and educational software programs. One medium size district, Paris I.S. D., extolled the benefit of acquiring additional educational technology this way:

> *"The Chapter 2 program provided media and videodisc technology to enhance the education of high school gifted/talented and advanced academic students,*

> *middle school gifted//talented and talent pool students, and junior and high school regular level science students. Because of a lack of finances, Paris ISD would not have been fiscally able to provide the technology to implement these innovations; consequently, the student achievements accomplished with this technology would not have been possible."*

In terms of the benefits of Chapter 2 for students, only two respondents gave their programs credit for directly improving students' academic performance. This is consistent with the generally accepted view that Chapter 2 programs' contribution to academic improvement is generally indirect. On the other hand, many respondents attributed to their innovative project improvements in students' attitudes and in students' interest and excitement about school. In addition, several respondents reported that their students' exposure to new and exciting instructional materials and programs benefited them significantly.

Several other district respondents reported improvements in students' creativity, research skills, and critical thinking abilities due to their participation in a campus level Chapter 2 project. The Chapter 2 coordinator from Abilene I.S. D. had this to say about how students benefited:

> *"Teachers consistently reported that all students experienced a higher rate of success in obtaining information and that they had become more skilled in evaluating, and using information pertinent to their assigned topics. An additional, unexpected benefit of the program was (the) interest and excitement it raised in the students about research. Students became independent users and continually utilized the computer data base to retrieve information after required assignments were completed."*

As these comments indicate, Chapter 2 funding of innovative projects enables districts not only to reach more students through additional resources, but also to provide special programs that enrich students' educational experiences.

In order to obtain specific information about each innovative project, districts submitted a "Program Synopsis" that described project activities, expected outcomes, and program benefits. Examination of the program synopses resulted in identifying two exemplary projects whose synopses are provided in the pages that follow. Program synopses for all of the innovative projects remain on file at the Texas Education Agency.

TARGETED AREA #6: INNOVATIVE PROJECTS

SYNOPSIS OF EXEMPLARY PROJECT #1

Program: People Place
District: Houston
Funding: $284,167
Program Scope: District-wide
# Students: 6,000 per year
# Staff: 7
Grade Levels: 2-6

Program Description / Activities Conducted

The People Place \ Cluster Center has proven to be an effective innovative technique for promoting an understanding of and respect for people from different cultures. Students learn by interacting with adult instructors in classrooms that have been turned into simulated cultural environments from six different countries: Africa/Nigeria, China, France, Germany, India, and Mexico. During their visit to the center, students dress in native clothing; listen to native music and play native musical instruments; view artifacts, replicas and displays; learn foreign words; create arts and crafts; sample native foods; and participate in a traditional dance. The information they learn about the cultures of those six countries is compared and contrasted with the cultural make-up of the U.S.A. and Texas.

Program Objectives / Outcomes Expected

By the end of the 1990-91 school year, 80 percent of the children visiting People Place will have demonstrated an awareness:

- Of contributions from each culture toured.
- Of similarities and differences in cultures.
- That culture is learned, not inborn.

Program Benefits

The People Place curriculum is correlated with second through sixth grade Houston ISD proficiencies. Using a Project ACCESS interdisciplinary approach, the center allows students to participate in math, science, social studies, and health as well as English, language arts, and the fine arts.

(A videotape, photographic album, and more detailed report prepared by Houston Independent School District is available through the Division of Policy Planning and Evaluation, Texas Education Agency.)

TARGETED AREA #6: INNOVATIVE PROJECTS

SYNOPSIS OF EXEMPLARY PROGRAM #2

Project:	Innovative Projects
Name:	Conroe
Funding:	$150,193
Program Scope:	District-wide
# Students:	40,761
# Staff:	193
Grade Levels:	Kindergarten - 6

Program Description / Activities Conducted

At the secondary level, improved technology was provided for students in English language arts classes to provide increased opportunities to apply that technology in journalism and creative writing. In addition, improved technology was used to implement the district's Marine Science instructional program which is Kindergarten-12. At the elementary level, keyboarding was implemented to improve the technological skills of grade 3 students, and competitive grants were offered to elementary schools to implement innovative instructional programs.

Program Objectives / Outcomes Expected

- To implement the Marine Science instructional program.
- To implement campus level innovative instructional programs in language arts, mathematics, and science for possible replication on other campuses.
- To improve students' keyboarding skills.
- To improve the quality of student writing.

Program Benefits

The students and staff involved in this project were able to participate in innovative programs particularly designed for their needs. The projects implemented showed improved grades, student motivation, and class participation. The project allowed the students to be exposed to improved technology and new skills that they can use in "real life" applications.

TARGETED AREA #2

"Programs for the acquisition and use of instructional and educational materials that would be used to improve the quality of instruction."

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

PROGRAMS: 18 school districts from the sample of 50 districts conducted 25 programs in this targeted area. An additional 13 programs were conducted by private schools. A total of 38 programs reported data in this targeted area.

FUNDS EXPENDED: $752,056 were expended by the 18 independent school districts and the 13 private nonprofit schools.

Statewide, public schools expended $9,352,107 in this targeted area and private schools expended $723,196. Funds expended on each program in the study sample ranged from $98 in one of the private schools to $172,692 in one of the largest urban districts in the state.

NUMBER OF STUDENTS TARGETED: 124,666 students in the combined public and private nonprofit schools.

NUMBER OF STAFF INVOLVED: 4,446 personnel in the combined public and private nonprofit schools.

This figure includes librarians, faculty, and staff who participated in programs of acquiring and using instructional and educational materials funded through Chapter 2.

PROFILE OF THE SAMPLE DISTRICTS

The distribution of the 18 independent school districts along the two demographic variables, *average daily attendance*, and *percentage of ethnic minority students*, is reported in Table 25. All 13 of the private nonprofit schools that participated in the study lie within the boundaries of Northeast Independent School District which is located in San Antonio, Texas.

TABLE 25

INSTRUCTIONAL & EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS: DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF DISTRICTS

	Average Daily Attendance							
Percent Minority	**>50,000**	**25,000-49,000**	**10,000-24,999**	**5,000-9,999**	**3,000-5,000**	**1,600-2,999**	**1,000-1,599**	**<500**
50% & over	1	1		4	1			1
30% - 49%		1	1			1		1
10% - 19%		1	1			1	1	1
5% - 9%		1						

TYPES OF PROGRAMS

Acquiring instructional and educational materials has historically been the most common use of Chapter 2 funds by the independent school districts and private nonprofit schools. In 1990-91, funding for this program area accounted for 35 percent of all public school district Chapter 2 funds and 88 percent of all private school Chapter 2 funds. The districts and private nonprofit schools used their Chapter 2 funded acquisitions primarily to supplement and enrich their existing library and classroom instructional resources. Detailed information about the types of instructional and educational materials acquired by districts and private nonprofit schools with Chapter 2 funds is collected annually by the Texas Education Agency and reported to the U. S. Department of Education through the Chapter 2 State Annual Report. Because evaluation data for this targeted area are collected routinely, the area was given the least emphasis in the effectiveness evaluation report.

PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

TYPES OF ACQUISITIONS

Although the *types* of acquisitions that districts make and the overall *purpose* for those acquisitions are not, strictly speaking, measures of program effectiveness, those two issues were addressed in the evaluation study. In reference to the types of acquisitions districts make, the Chapter 2 State Annual Report groups instructional and educational materials into three categories: 1) library materials, 2) computer software/hardware, and 3) other instructional materials. In order to obtain more detailed information for the purpose of this study, districts were requested to report the types of materials they acquired using *six* categories. Analysis of the survey information based on six categories made even further specificity of material types possible as the data on acquisitions in Table 26 indicate.

As the data in Table 26 show, the most common acquisition among the sample schools was library books (31 programs) which is consistent with the fact that supplementing library purchases is the most common use of Chapter 2 funds. Not included in Table 26 are some unique acquisitions: one district purchased educational video discs to supplement the district's library computer learning center; one district upgraded its computer's memory capacity in order to provide for improved student instruction; and another paid for a subscription to a local educational television broadcast in order to bring instructional TV programs into classrooms.

TABLE 26

INSTRUCTIONAL & EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS: TYPE OF ACQUISITIONS

Acquisition	Programs	Reporting
Library books	31	(82%)
Audio & audiovisual equipment (video, tapes, TV)	27	(71%)
Computer software	18	(47%)
Computer hardware/equipment	15	(39%)
Audio & audiovisual instructional kits	12	(32%)
Library related equipment	10	(26%)
Classroom materials (maps, globes)	6	(16%)
Manipulatives	6	(16%)
Laboratory equipment	2	(5%)

In reference to the rationale for acquiring materials, respondents were asked to identify their program according to its general purpose. Nearly all of the respondents (36 of 38) reported that the instructional materials were acquired for *program enrichment* and 12 of those added that *remedial instruction* was a secondary purpose.

EVALUATION RESOURCES

The overall rationale for local school districts that use Chapter 2 funds to acquire supplemental instructional materials is to improve students' access to information resources and technology. Those programs, therefore, are not expected to directly affect students' grades or achievement test scores. Nevertheless, those programs can still make a significant, albeit indirect, contribution to school improvement. This contribution sometimes can be more direct, for example, when schools acquire materials to be used by a specific group of students, such as those considered "at-risk" of failure or of dropping out of school.

To find out the extent to which districts acquired materials specifically for at-risk students, they were requested in the survey to estimate the percentage of their program that targeted the needs of at-risk students. For the 27 programs that responded to this survey item, the estimates ranged from *3 percent* for one program to *100 percent* for two programs. The average estimate of the amount of the materials acquisition program dedicated to at-risk students was *30 percent*.

Chapter 2 coordinators who used funds to acquire educational materials were just as concerned about evaluating their projects as their counterparts with programs that directly assist at-risk students. According to the survey responses, every program already had some type of program evaluation established as a routine practice in their schools. The methods for evaluating the materials acquisitions programs, of course, varied for each district.

The types of evaluation resources used by coordinators of those programs are reported in Table 27, which shows that "teacher/staff surveys" was the most common resource used to evaluate the Chapter 2 materials acquisition programs. The sample districts reported using surveys to assess effectiveness in a variety of ways, such as how often students and teachers used the new materials, and how useful and effective the teachers believed the new materials to be for instructional purposes.

TABLE 27

INSTRUCTIONAL & EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS: EVALUATION RESOURCES

Data Source	Programs Reporting	
Teacher/staff surveys	34	(89%)
Classroom observations	23	(61%)
Student surveys	14	(39%)
Student products	11	(29%)
Standardized achievement tests	10	(26%)
School records	9	(24%)
Parent surveys	5	(13%)
Locally developed tests	3	(8%)
Other (inventories, usage reports, etc.)	5	(13%)

After "survey instruments," classroom observations of how equipment and materials were used was the second most common way of assessing program effectiveness. For 14 of the programs, students were surveyed to learn their patterns of equipment use and perceptions of the quality of their materials. Standardized tests were reportedly used by ten programs, but the information submitted to the Agency was insufficient to determine how test results were used to evaluate the programs. A very few districts reported using simple inventories as evaluation tools.

OBSERVABLE OUTCOMES

As the data in Table 27 have indicated, the Chapter 2 coordinators in the research sample generally reported that they routinely evaluate the amount of use and the effectiveness of the educational materials acquired with Chapter 2 funds. Consequently, in response to the Agency survey item that requested the districts to indicate any observable outcomes that could be attributed to their Chapter 2 acquisition programs, district respondents provided ample data, as Table 28 illustrates below. All of the respondents claimed "improved academic performance" from students who used the new equipment and, or new materials. Another fairly large proportion (82 percent) reported "improved student interest in the subject matter" being studied with the new acquisitions, which is a highly reasonable outcome. The same proportion of respondents reported "improved student attitudes about school." Overall, the respondents reported fairly high levels of positive student outcomes due to the presence and use of Chapter 2-funded instructional materials.

TABLE 28

INSTRUCTIONAL & EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS: OBSERVABLE OUTCOMES

Observable Outcomes	Programs Reporting	
Improved academic performance	38	(100%)
Improved student interest in the subject matter	32	(84%)
Improved student attitudes about school	31	(82%)
Improved student use of resources	27	(71%)
Improved classroom instructional methods	24	(63%)
Improved classroom participation	23	(61%)
Improved student reading habits	22	(58%)
Improved student completion of tasks	16	(42%)

PROGRAM BENEFITS

INDIRECT BENEFITS

School district Chapter 2 coordinators and project directors described contributions of their Chapter 2-sponsored materials acquisition program in their own words, by addressing the following item in the narrative component of the survey:

> *"Describe briefly the greatest contribution, or asset, to your district made possible by the existence of Chapter 2 funds."*

For most of the school districts and private nonprofit schools, the reported benefits were strikingly similar: Chapter 2 funds enabled schools to add to their instructional resources a significant amount of books, visual aids, manipulatives, and other materials which enriched students' learning opportunities. For most of the districts and private nonprofit schools in the study sample, these additional materials would not have been acquired otherwise. The second commonly reported benefit was that of providing classrooms and laboratories with new or additional educational technology in the form of personal computers and software programs. In several cases, because of Chapter 2, students were able to work with personal computers for the very first time. In other cases, experienced students were able to use software which encouraged and enhanced their creativity and critical thinking skills. Through some programs, teachers observed an improvement in their students' writing skills as well as an increased interest in their school work.

A teacher from Wichita Falls ISD described the following contribution of Chapter 2:

> *"The greatest contribution made possible by Chapter 2 funds is the provision of a computer writing lab. This lab enhances the writing workshop currently in existence by giving students experience with composing, revising, and editing that they would not have otherwise. Students have become more fluent writers and have become more enthusiastic about participating in writing workshops. Success in writing also raises the students' self-esteem. More positive attitudes toward writing and increased motivation for learning have been observed."*

A Chapter 2 coordinator at Frost ISD contributed these comments:

> *"Chapter 2 funds allow us to greatly expand the offerings of our library to students and teachers. Having up-to-date and attractive materials sparks student interest. Research projects that involve reading and writing skills are dependent on having appropriate materials available. Rapidly changing world situations and scientific advances make it imperative to constantly update library collections. Funding from Chapter 2 permits our school district to purchase materials for use by students from kindergarten through senior high school."*

In order to obtain specific information about each program, districts submitted a "Program Synopsis" for each program that provided information describing project activities, expected outcomes, and perceived benefits. Examination of those synopses resulted in identifying at least two programs with exemplary objectives and outcomes. Their synopses are provided below. All program synopses remain on file at the Texas Education Agency.

TARGETED AREA #2: ACQUISITION OF INSTRUCTIONAL AND EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS

SYNOPSIS OF EXEMPLARY PROGRAM #1

Project: Instructional Materials Acquisition
District: Paris ISD
Funding: $20,132
Program Scope: District-wide
# Students: 750
# Staff: 9
Grade Levels: Prekindergarten - 12

Program Description / Activities Conducted

Middle school libraries were upgraded and computerized to better meet the research and reading-for-pleasure needs of students. High school advanced academic and gifted/talented students utilized computer software and hardware to further develop their research and writing skills. A creative writing course was established at grade 8 utilizing Chapter 2-funded software and hardware. Library book collections were supplemented and audiovisual materials were upgraded.

Program Objectives / Outcomes Expected

- The district will upgrade and computerize middle school libraries.
- The district will develop and implement a creative/process writing course at grade 8.
- Students will increase their computer skills at grade 8 in preparation for high school.
- Students at an advanced academic and gifted and talented high school level will increase their experience with computers.

Program Benefits

Equipment was obtained that upgraded library resources and led to the development of new courses. Writing skills of students improved. Students became better prepared for high school English courses.

TARGETED AREA #2: ACQUISITION OF INSTRUCTIONAL AND EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS

SYNOPSIS OF EXEMPLARY PROGRAM #2

Project: Instructional Materials Acquisition
District: Amarillo ISD
Funding: $45,000
Program Scope: Campus level
# Students: 500
# Staff: 20
Grade Levels: 1-5

Program Description / Activities Conducted

The Rogers Technology Project involved implementation of an integrated learning system (ILS) which provided a computerized, individualized approach to student learning. Students work on their own level and at their own pace through a sequential set of skills. The computer network includes a 23 work-station lab and 31 work stations distributed in classrooms throughout the building.

Program Objectives / Outcomes Expected

- Program to be utilized by all students.
- Extended application by grades 2 and 3 as control group for a 3-year study.
- Implementation of research model to study outcome of students' use of the integrated learning system (ILS).

Program Benefits

The program allows for early intervention for at-risk students and provides a model for the use of similar programs for at-risk students.

PART III

- **STATE AGENCY DIRECTED CHAPTER 2 PROGRAMS: THE SPECIAL DISCRETIONARY PROJECTS**

STATE AGENCY DIRECTED CHAPTER 2 PROGRAMS: THE SPECIAL DISCRETIONARY PROJECTS

As discussed earlier, the Texas Education Agency uses 20 percent of the Chapter 2 state allotment to fund special discretionary projects, provide technical assistance to districts in implementing targeted assistance programs, and administer Chapter 2 programs. During 1990-91, the Agency conducted fifteen special discretionary projects. These projects corresponded to one or more of the State Board of Education's long-range goals and objectives and addressed four of the six Chapter 2 targeted assistance program areas.

Most district-level projects were designed to provide model programs that could be replicated by other districts with similar needs. Detailed replication guides were developed by all participating districts. These guides are available through the Texas Dropout Information Clearinghouse at the Texas Education Agency.

Although the Agency administered the discretionary projects, it distributed most of the funds to independent school districts which implemented and managed the projects locally. Forty-nine independent school districts and all twenty regional education service centers participated in locally managed discretionary projects in school year 1990-91. The 1990-91 discretionary projects and their funding levels are reported below.

1991-90 CHAPTER 2 SPECIAL DISCRETIONARY PROJECTS

Targeted Area 1. Programs to meet the educational needs of students at risk of failure in school and of dropping out.

1.	Family Involvement in Education for At-Risk Children and Parents.	$755,528
2.	Extended Day Programs for At-Risk Latchkey School-Age Children.	$500,000
3.	Literacy Program for Limited English Proficient Students Entering School Without Previous Schooling.	$375,000
4.	Cooperative Learning/Continuous Progress At-Risk Programs for Pre-Kindergarten - 8th Grade.	$330,000
5.	Alternative Summer Tutorial Program for At-Risk Students.	$175,000

Targeted Area 3. Innovative programs designed to carry out schoolwide improvements, including the effective schools program.

6. Education Service Center Funding for Targeted Campuses Using Effective Schools Correlates and Practices, Parent and Community Involvement.	$1,600,000
7. Implementing the Effective Schools Program through the Performance Based Accreditation Process: The Role of the Cooperative Superintendency Program Fellows in the Effective Schools Data Resource Unit of the Division of Accreditation.	$282,247
8. Effective Schools Programs Research and Evaluation. Component 1: A Study of the Impact of Educational Reform on At-Risk Students. Component 2: An Evaluation of Prekindergarten Programs in Texas.	$280,500
9. Involving Principals, Superintendents, Central Office Administrators, and School Board Members in the School Accreditation Process.	$208,000

Targeted Area 4. Programs of training and professional development to enhance the knowledge and skills of educational personnel.

10. Increasing At-Risk Gifted Minority Student Involvement in Problem Solving Skills.	$300,000
11. Priority Staff Development Model for Increasing Student Mastery of Academic Skills.	$300,000
12. Enhancing the Quality and Retention of Minority Teachers and Teachers in Critical Shortage Areas.	$300,000
13. Texas Education Agency Training and Professional Development for Effective Schools Programs.	$180,000
14. Innovative Instructional Program for Academically Talented Teachers of Tomorrow and ExCET Skills Training for Teachers of Today.	$50,000

Targeted Area 6. Other innovative projects which would enhance the educational program and climate of the school.

15. Texas Project 2061: Science for All Americans.	$25,000

EVALUATION OF DISCRETIONARY PROJECTS

Special discretionary projects were evaluated by Texas Education Agency staff. Each discretionary project had an Agency project director who worked with the local project managers and with staff in the Division of Policy Planning and Evaluation to ensure effective project implementation and evaluation. Staff in the Policy Planning and Evaluation division provided evaluation technical assistance to each of the discretionary project directors at the early stages of each project. The scope of that evaluation assistance varied among the different projects based upon their needs, but generally entailed the following activities:

- Creating, editing, and revising data collection instruments and questionnaires.
- Creating, editing, and revising interview protocols.
- Discussing and selecting evaluation data to be collected.
- Developing and revising tables for reporting programmatic data.
- Tabulating, analyzing, and interpreting collected data.
- Writing and disseminating project evaluation reports.

For those discretionary projects that involved local school districts, the district level project manager was responsible for collecting and reporting data to the project director at the Agency. The Agency discretionary project directors were responsible for analyzing their projects' data, evaluating their projects' overall effectiveness, and reporting their findings in an evaluation report to the Chapter 2 Advisory Committee. The evaluation reports have proven useful to the Texas Education Agency for making policy decisions regarding the future uses of Chapter 2 discretionary funds. The evaluation reports for each of the 1990-91 discretionary projects have been summarized for inclusion in this program effectiveness report and are provided in the section that follows. Recommendations made for each project are those of the project directors and do not necessarily reflect the opinion of staff responsible for preparing this document. More detailed versions of the evaluation reports are available through the appropriate division of the Texas Education Agency.

FAMILY INVOLVEMENT IN EDUCATION FOR AT-RISK CHILDREN AND PARENTS

Division: Adult Education/Employment and Training Funding and Compliance
Funding: $755,528

Purpose and Major Objectives

The purpose was to encourage family involvement in education with specific objectives for both the parents and their school age children. The objectives of this project included the following:

1. Assist at-risk families with parenting strategies in child growth and development and educational processes for children ages 0 through 12.
2. Coordinate efforts with existing adult basic education, literacy programs and vocational programs to assist adult participants in raising their educational level.
3. Educate at-risk parents of relevant public assistance programs and encourage voluntary participation in community affairs.
4. Provide child care and tutorial services for children of at-risk families simultaneously scheduled with parent education classes.

Major Activities Conducted or Services Provided

Existing programs in adult basic education, adult literacy, or adult vocational education were coordinated in seven participating districts. Parents of at-risk students were required to attend either a vocational program in order to develop a specific job skill, or an adult basic education program in order to prepare for or achieve the high school equivalency test (GED). The adult basic education classes were held at elementary and middle schools.

Parents attended at least one meeting per week that was dedicated to parent education on public assistance programs and community involvement where information on community services was presented to meet parents' needs. Parents were encouraged to become involved in community activities such as volunteer work.

Parents were required to attend at least one meeting per week to facilitate training and enable them to assist their children ages 4 through 12 in the learning process. Similarly, parents of infant to 3 year old children were involved in a "Parent as Teachers" or similar learning program.

Developmental child care was available for infants to 4 year-old children while parents attended adult classes and parent education activities. Some of the child care facilities provided a training site for those parents who coordinated this training with the licensing agency. Tutorial services in mathematics and reading were provided for children aged 5 to 12 years old while their parents attended evening classes.

Project Benefits

All of the project's objectives were accomplished and 866 families and 1,616 children participated in this program. Surveys and interviews with parents indicated that all components---parenting, adult education, public assistance programs, child care and tutorials for the children---were vital to the program.

Districts reported that at least 50 percent of their adults enrolled in classes completed the program. Of the districts that reported data, the following is a list of percentages of parents that completed at least 50 percent of their classes: adult basic education (58 percent), English Literacy (59 percent), vocational education (72 percent), parenting (55 percent), and community service (55 percent).

Participating students' report card grades for the second and last six weeks of school were compared and 56 percent of the students maintained or improved in mathematics and 65 percent maintained or improved in reading. Comparisons of achievement test scores for 1989-1990 and 1990-1991 revealed that 46 percent of the participating students had maintained or improved their mathematics score and 55 percent had maintained or improved their reading score.

Analysis of student records for the 1989-1990 and 1990-1991 school year indicated that 59 percent of the students had reduced absenteeism and 90 percent had fewer discipline problems reported during this time frame.

Responses to the parent surveys overwhelmingly indicated that the parenting component allowed project families the opportunity to learn to communicate more effectively with family members. The majority of the parents surveyed responded favorably to the effectiveness of the training received.

Recommendations

When project leaders for parental involvement programs coordinate effectively with other community programs and sources and they are given flexibility from the state agency to tailor a program to their particular community, then such programs have a good chance for success. Such projects could be improved by securing a higher level of involvement from the principal(s) of the school(s) where the project is implemented. Also, the project administrator should devote at least 75 percent of his/her time to this project. Additionally, a concise plan for recruitment and retention of families should be developed prior to program implementation. Activities for marketing the program to future participants should be included in such a plan.

EXTENDED DAY PROGRAM FOR AT-RISK LATCHKEY SCHOOL-AGE CHILDREN

Division: Special Programs Planning & Implementation
Funding: $500,000

Purpose and Major Objectives

This project was designed to provide quality care for children before and after school hours, during school holidays, and during the summer. Objectives focused on:

1. Meeting the needs of and promoting the physical, social, emotional and cognitive development of the participating children.
2. Providing a curriculum which encouraged the children to be actively involved with a variety of developmentally appropriate activities.
3. Providing indoor and outdoor physical environments that enabled students with the opportunity for conceptual learning, positive adult / peer interactions and environmental exploration and involvement.
4. Providing safe and healthy environments.
5. Providing nutritious food and positive experiences with food preparations.
6. Developing a systematic assessment of the effectiveness of the program.
7. Developing and disseminating instructional materials and resources.
8. Developing an operations/process manual for replicating the model.

Major Activities Conducted or Services Provided

Over 900 students participated in the specially designed programs to provide after and before school care to latchkey children. Programs were provided in nine school districts and each one developed programs that provided a variety of learning experiences in areas including art, music, clowning, puppet design, dance, cooperative physical and cognitive play, dramatic play, field trips, publishing, life skills development, second language acquisition, and club membership.

Additionally, students received tutoring support in language arts, mathematics and computer assisted instruction. While each program had different features with varied levels of participation, all programs enjoyed increased levels of positive parental involvement. Furthermore, all of the school districts provided project staff with extensive training so that innovations could be properly implemented.

Project Benefits

Research results indicated that substantial gains were made towards the accomplishment of desired outcomes. Results of teacher surveys indicated that teachers generally perceived the existence of a better attitude toward school from the children in the program. All programs reported that students demonstrated dramatically increased willingness to share materials, work with peers, and turn in homework.

Attitude assessments indicated that students developed more positive attitudes about themselves and about schooling as a result of the projects. Additionally, district records showed increased student proficiency in mathematics, reading and writing, and decreased levels of student absenteeism and office referral.

Recommendations

A project like this should be funded for a minimum of three years to allow a more complete opportunity to implement the projects and evaluate student outcomes. Furthermore, greater state resources should be devoted to providing technical assistance to districts to ensure the success of such programs. Also, greater resources should be devoted to bringing attention to successful projects and disseminating information that results in project replication.

LITERACY PROGRAM FOR LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP) STUDENTS ENTERING SCHOOL WITHOUT PREVIOUS SCHOOLING IN GRADES 6-12

Division: Special Programs Planning and Implementation
Funding: $375,000

Purpose and Major Objectives

This project was designed to promote and ensure school success of immigrant, limited English proficient students in grades 6-12 who did not have previous schooling and/or who were preliterate in their native language. Objectives focused on identifying preliterate and/or recent immigrant limited English proficient students; assessing their academic, language, and social needs; and providing supplemental instructional services to meet those needs. The outcomes of the instructional services were that student participants would:

1. Acquire literacy skills.
2. Acquire proficiency in English.
3. Gain familiarity with their communities and American culture.
4. Gain academic skills that led to passing the Exit Level Texas Assessment of Academic Skills examination.
5. Develop positive self-concepts and positive attitudes about school and learning.

Major Activities Conducted or Services Provided

Over 300 students participated in specially designed programs to ensure that neither their lack of previous schooling, their limited proficiency in English, nor their lack of literacy in their native language would prevent their success in school. Five school districts participated in the project. Parental involvement was a major component in every district's program. Each district, however, employed different approaches which included:

1. Computer assisted instruction under the guidance of a lead teacher and bilingual instructional aides.
2. Project HOSTS (Helping One Student to Succeed) which provides a highly individualized non-traditional program that included one-on-one tutoring.

3. Middle School Literacy Program which uses a variety of instructional approaches including "cooperative learning," "whole language," and "total physical response."

4. Cooperative learning and other strategies in a content-based approach to help students acquire proficiency in English while refining student strengths in Spanish. Certified teachers from Mexico were hired as teacher aides.

5. A significantly reduced pupil-teacher ratio and an interdisciplinary thematic curriculum combined with the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA).

6. Development of a technical assistance manual for implementing similar programs at other school districts.

Project Benefits

Evaluation results suggest that substantial gains were made towards the accomplishment of desired outcomes. Specifically, students demonstrated:

- Dramatically increased proficiency in English based on a variety of language proficiency tests.
- Substantial gains in reading, writing, and language arts skills on both norm-referenced and criterion-referenced tests.
- Students developed more positive attitudes about themselves and about schooling.

Recommendations

Projects such as these should be funded for a minimum of three years to allow sufficient time for improved implementing the projects and evaluating student outcomes. Furthermore, greater state agency resources should be devoted to providing technical assistance to ensure the success of such programs.

COOPERATIVE LEARNING/CONTINUOUS PROGRESS AT-RISK PROGRAMS FOR PREKINDERGARTEN - GRADE 8 STUDENTS

Division: Special Programs Planning & Implementation
Funding: $330,000

Purpose and Major Objectives

The primary focus of this project was to test the effectiveness of two research-based models, *Cooperative Learning* and *Continuous Progress*, with students identified as at-risk in grade levels Prekindergarten through grade 8.

The objectives of the *Cooperative Learning* model were:

1. To develop learning activities in structured teams.
2. Provide recognition based on the performance of all team members.
3. Instruct students at the same level in a hierarchy of skills.
4. Provide frequent student assessment.
5. Implement corrective procedures for students not meeting a pre-set level of mastery.

The objectives of the *Continuous Progress* model were:

1. To instruct students in a well-defined hierarchy of skills.
2. Provide for student testing at each level for readiness to move on to the next skill and receive further instruction in skills they have not mastered.
3. Maintain records of student's progress through the curriculum for the purposes of grouping, remediation, and other decisions.
4. Instruct students in groups at the same level.

Major Activities Conducted or Services Provided

Six independent school districts participated in the project; one district provided staff development services to two staff members of a private nonprofit school. The major activities and services included: extensive in-depth staff development in the programs; continuous in-class follow-up from expert coaches; administrative facilitation; development of integrated curriculum documents; acquisition of materials designed for the program; adoption of existing materials; and development of a replication manual.

Project Benefits

The objectives of the project and the anticipated outcomes or desired results were accomplished/achieved by each participating district and campus. Highlights of these results follow.

- An increase in student achievement.

  In one district, a participating campus reported that the grades in the Language Arts class rose an average of 5.7 points as compared to 4.1 points at the comparison school. This same campus reported that the normal curve equivalents on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills increased an average of 2.3 points as compared to an average increase of .7 points at the comparison school.

- An increase in students' positive attitudes toward self and school.

  One district's participating campus reported that 80 percent of the students in grades 3-5 had a positive attitude toward self and school as compared to 58 percent at the comparison school. Another campus reported that discipline referrals were reduced by 34 cases for the project year and that 100 percent of all library books were returned, which had never occurred before. In addition, another campus reported that the students' positive attitudes toward school had influenced their parents' attitudes toward school. In school year 1989-90, only 15 parent surveys were returned. In school year 1990-91, 120 parent surveys were returned, 118 of which were positive.

- A decrease in the number of students retained.

  One campus reported that in school year 1989-90, 17 students were retained as compared to 4 students in 1990-91.

- A decrease in the number of at-risk students.

  One campus reported that the number of students identified as at-risk according to state criteria had decreased by 34.

Recommendations

It would be advantageous if a grant could extend over a two-year period. This extended time would allow for better understanding of the methods and strategies taught, and provide more opportunities for practice, feedback, and adjustments.

ALTERNATIVE SUMMER TUTORIAL PROJECT FOR AT-RISK STUDENTS

Division: Special Programs Planning and Implementation
Funding: $175,000

Purpose and Major Objectives

This project's purpose was to provide remedial tutoring opportunities for students who failed the Texas Educational Assessment of Minimum Skills (TEAMS) High School Exit Test and, thus, were unable to received a high school diploma. In many of the tutoring sites the population was expanded to include ninth and eleventh graders who also had not mastered the TAAS (Texas Assessment of Academic Skills) objectives.

Major Activities Conducted or Services Provided

Supplementary tutoring was provided during the summer for students who needed to retake the TAAS or the TEAMS examination. Tutoring activities included intensive remediation of TAAS skills using one-to-one instruction, peer tutoring, small class instruction, varied teaching strategies to address different learning styles, drill and practice exercises, computer assisted instruction, individualized instructional programs, and constant reinforcement of test taking skills, test anxiety management, and positive self esteem.

Project Benefits

A total of 2667 students were served in the summer tutorial programs. The total number of males served was 1153 and the total number of females was 956. Students needing remediation in mathematics and language arts sections received either one-to-one, or small group tutoring. Specific information regarding the total number of students who mastered TEAMS/TAAS objectives at the next test administration was not available. All projects pretested and post-tested their students, which resulted in a noticeable reduction in students' test stress and an increase in personal confidence and self-esteem.

Recommendations

In order to better monitor project results, the state agency should provide more detailed information to guide tutoring programs. The programs need to provide more detailed information on the educational materials they use. Computer assisted instructional materials should be more widely used in summer tutorials.

EDUCATION SERVICE CENTER FUNDING FOR TARGETED CAMPUSES USING EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS CORRELATES, PARENT AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT [TEXAS RENEWAL INITIATIVE (TRI) PROJECT]

Division: Accreditation and School Improvement
Funding: $1,600,000

Purpose and Major Objectives

The purpose and major objectives of the project were to provide targeted, low-performing elementary campuses with the greatest need with a comprehensive approach to increasing student performance in reading, writing, and mathematics by strengthening the teaching process, as well as by increasing parental involvement. An average of twelve campuses for each of 20 service regions were identified by each regional Education Service Center (ESC). Major objectives were to enhance the teaching process through effective school correlates using:

1. Proper planning.
2. Identification of appropriate teaching strategies and methodologies.
3. Curriculum alignment.
4. The effective use of instructional resources.
5. Effective involvement of parents in the school improvement process itself.

All goals and objectives were to be attained through intensive on-site and center-based training provided by the regional education service center Texas Renewal Initiative (TRI) staff.

Major Activities Conducted or Services Provided

The final evaluations submitted by the TRI regional projects indicated that the major activities and services provided impacted 245 low performing campuses serving approximately 120,000 students. Determination of low performance campuses centered on student performance results as measured by criterion-referenced tests. Specific documentation was maintained to identify how the needs assessments for low performing campuses were conducted. The identification of those areas needing the most attention in the project schools was a comprehensive process. Meetings were held with superintendents, principals, and in some cases (ESC, Region III), with campus improvement teams.

Research showed that there were three major training strands common to all the regional service center projects: basic skills training, effective schools correlates, and parental and community involvement. Over 567 basic skills training sessions were reported by the project sites during the year. TRI schools were treated to more than 360 effective schools correlates workshops during this same period and at least 282 training sessions for increased parental and community participation.

Project Benefits

Overall, the objectives of the TRI project were accomplished and the anticipated outcomes were achieved. This particular perception was determined through an agency-designed survey questionnaire that was submitted by the regional service center TRI consultants to project school teachers and administrators. The final evaluations reveal statements that clearly indicate a renewed commitment to increasing the current levels of parental and community involvement and to exploring untried alternatives to helping schools and parents and the community to come together for the sake of the children.

One unanticipated outcome occurred in ESC, Region VII: as a result of the focus on parent and community involvement, six service center consultants in various departments within the service center established the Region VIII ESC *Parental Involvement Task Force.* One of the major benefits from this task force was the sharing of ideas and relevant information among service center peers.

Recommendations

Future projects which strive to improve student performance of low performing campuses should consider several points. 1) A base line must be clearly identified and the exact nature of low performance must be described more accurately beyond the static picture provided by one measure of performance. Performance over time must be part of the definition because the data clearly show that there can exist improving, deteriorating, or stable campuses. 2) Address the issue of school culture as a contributing factor in low performance and introduce improvement measures from this approach. 3) Establish greater consensus among participants about what can best impact low performance based on review of recent literature and a period of planning. 4) Establish and implement increased levels of coordination at the state agency level; compiling and disseminating a specific list of state services that can assist projects of this nature would be invaluable to the service providers and the service recipients. 5) Increase the participation of administrators of low performing campuses with institutions of higher education. 6) Implement mentor relationships between staff at a low performing campus and staff at a high performing campus. 7) Introduce greater uniformity to the evaluation report format being utilized by each unit.

IMPLEMENTING THE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS PROGRAM THROUGH THE PERFORMANCE-BASED ACCREDITATION PROCESS: THE ROLE OF THE COOPERATIVE SUPERINTENDENCY PROGRAM FELLOWS IN THE EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS DATA RESOURCE UNIT IN THE DIVISION OF ACCREDITATION

Division: Accreditation and School Improvement
Funding: $282,420

Purpose and Major Objectives

This project entailed implementing the effective schools program through the performance-based accreditation process by utilizing the cooperative superintendency program fellows within the Division of Accreditation. This process was conducted in accordance with the criteria of the state adopted Principles, Standards, and Procedures for Accreditation of Texas School Districts and encompassed all of the operational components of a school system.

In order to supplement the Texas Education Agency's performance-based accreditation effort, a link was established between the University of Texas Cooperative Superintendency Program (CSP) and the Texas Education Agency's Division of Accreditation. Eight superintendency fellows were assigned to the Division of Accreditation. The following objectives were to be accomplished:

1. The production and enhancement of the District Performance Overview (DPO) document for accreditation evaluation purposes.
2. The ongoing training of the Division of Accreditation's consultants in the utilization of the DPO.
3. The professional development of the CSP fellows in the application, synthesis, and evaluation of the effective schools research and its implementation.
4. The provision of supplemental services and resources for accreditation teams and the provision of additional analysis of data to enhance the application of effective schools research at the district and campus level.
5. The dissemination of effective schools research, as it relates to the performance-based accreditation process, through staff development in local districts and presentations at conferences.

Major Activities Conducted or Services Provided

The CSP program fellows successfully participated in a number of activities to establish a performance-based accreditation system that focused on effective schools criteria. These activities, including the District Performance Overview document, were developed, field tested, and revised in order to enhance the accreditation process. Significant contributions were made in the areas of school district accreditation, staff development, technical assistance, programmatic planning, data analysis, Texas School Improvement Initiative (TSII) program, and other special programs. Examples include:

1. Provided training for all staff members in analyzing the DPO; as well as periodic training needed to coincide with the new research included in the DPO.
2. Analyzed and interpreted school district performance data.
3. Produced the District Performance Overview (DPO) reports for over 250 school districts annually.
4. Prepared staff development training for Texas Education Agency's Mid-Winter Conference.
5. Assisted in the management, organization, and facilitation of the TSII Program.
6. Designed, facilitated, and presented the staff development program training required for all TSII participants.
7. Delivered programs to state and regional conferences.

Project Benefits

The efforts of the CSP Fellows enhanced the supportive stance taken by TEA toward the improvement of educational quality at the local level. The DPO was used effectively to examine various aspects of student performance, district personnel and resources, and practices related to the effective schools factors. The DPO was also used by school districts for self-evaluation and improvement purposes. The development of the DPO prompted requests for staff development and inservice activities to agency and school district personnel. Increased utilization of the DPO encouraged input and feedback information which contributed to revising the content of student performance data to more accurately and appropriately address real-life public school needs. DPO revisions created a more effective research and data tool for the accreditation process and for strategic planning for local school districts.

The design and production of the DPO were evaluated throughout the project. Questionnaire survey results given to consultants revealed that the DPO was considered a highly effective tool for local districts to use in their improvement process. Respondents also indicated that the DPO was an effective tool in the accreditation review and report writing processes.

Recommendations

This project revealed that, for future purposes, there needs to be an integrated data based system that coordinates district profiles and the recently established system of academic excellence indicators. The DPO needs to be further refined. More information is needed on populations of students with special needs.

EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS PROGRAMS RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

COMPONENT 1: A STUDY OF THE IMPACT OF EDUCATIONAL REFORM ON AT-RISK STUDENTS

Division: Policy Planning & Evaluation
Funding: $28,000

Purpose and Major Objectives

To assess the impact of educational reform on at-risk students, 50 school districts participated in this research project which includes a longitudinal study of approximately 2,000 at-risk students. Specific policies of the State Board of Education are being addressed: the TEAMS/TAAS exit-level examination, attendance policies, the driver's license law, and the no pass/no play rule. Funds were used to continue the longitudinal study for a third year and to continue Phase II of a case study of eight high schools. The objectives of Component 1 include:

1. Assessing the impact of specific educational reform policies on at-risk students.
2. Examining the usage of the term "at-risk" and its effect on at-risk learners.
3. Exploring the relationship between state level policies and local level implementation practices.

Major Activities Conducted or Services Provided

Fifty school districts participating in the study completed, verified, and returned data sheets to the Texas Education Agency for the third year of a longitudinal study of 2,000 at-risk high school students. Data collection took place in spring 1991. For Phase II, a case study was conducted to assess the impact of reform policies. Teachers, counselors, principals, at-risk coordinators, and students were interviewed. A detailed data collection instrument was distributed to the eight high schools in the study. A contractor assisted in developing and implementing the study. The project began in the fall of 1990 and continued through August 1991. A summary report of the longitudinal and case study findings was prepared in the spring of 1991.

Project Benefits

The objectives of this study were fully accomplished. Data collection instruments and case study interviews, in combination with the statewide principal survey and other Agency data, have produced useful information regarding the effectiveness and impact of the reform policies. Several outcomes emerged from this study. The state agency learned about the lack of state level information about the effects, intended and/or unintended, of reform polices on at-risk and regular students. The study has provided outcome data related to the impact of the "no pass/no play" rule, the attendance policy, the driver's license law, and the TEAMS/TAAS examination.

The study also has helped clarify how the term "at-risk" is defined and applied in various schools, which is necessary information in order to understand how local interpretations of "at -risk" vary and how this variation may relate to the schools' ability to respond effectively to students' needs. Another benefit of the study has been the development of a positive working relationship between the Agency and the participating school districts. Specifically, the eight participating high schools have become interested and actively involved in continuing the evaluation. The study has provided a starting point for future cooperative efforts and joint projects between the Agency and local school districts.

Finally, this study has provided a foundation for exploring several research and evaluation activities related to at-risk students. Research findings have raised important questions and issues regarding the identification of effective dropout prevention programs, effectiveness of alternative high schools, school restructuring possibilities, and implementation of the "effective schools" model. In addition, this study has shown that the notion and use of the term "at-risk" needs to be studied and evaluated on an ongoing basis.

A detailed report of the research findings, *Preliminary Findings: A Study of the Impact of Educational Reform on At-Risk Students in Texas*. (January, 1991), is available from the Texas Education Agency Publications Office. That report contains findings regarding the research questions listed below:

How many students are dropping out of school?
How is the "at-risk" status established by local school districts?
How were the policies implemented?
What consequences have followed from the new attendance policy?
What have been the effects of the No Pass/No Play policy?
What have been the effects of the new Driver's License Law?
What consequences have followed from the policies regarding the TEAMS Exit-Level Examination?

Recommendations

Preliminary findings from the evaluation of the impact of educational reform on at-risk students revealed the need for action in several areas, including, but not limited to: 1) refinement of the definition and usage of the term "at-risk" until it is 80 percent accurate and can be used successfully to direct resources to students in need; 2) creation of a youth development policy at the state level, with special reference to the conditions leading to at-risk learners; and, 3) periodic and systematic reassessments of the impact of reform policies by examining objective indicators of student achievement as well as by surveying opinions of students, parents, community leaders and education professionals.

EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS PROGRAMS RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

COMPONENT 2: AN EVALUATION OF PREKINDERGARTEN PROGRAMS IN TEXAS

Division: Policy Planning & Evaluation
Funding: $61,000

Purpose and Major Objectives

The purpose of this project was to assess the effectiveness of prekindergarten programs in Texas through a three-component study. Of the 507 districts providing prekindergarten instruction, over 470 districts and 1300 campuses responded to a statewide prekindergarten survey. Twenty school districts are participating in the longitudinal study of approximately 2,600 students enrolled in prekindergarten during the 1989-90 school year, in relation to a comparison group of approximately 600 students. In addition, ten campuses participated in a case study. The objectives of Component 2 include:

1. Examine statewide prekindergarten program characteristics and implementation.
2. Assess the impact of prekindergarten on participating students.
3. Examine the assessment of students and the use of developmentally appropriate practices in prekindergarten programs.

Major Activities Conducted or Services Provided

Twenty school districts participating in the study of the impact of prekindergarten submitted research survey sheets, completed and verified, to the Agency for the second year of a longitudinal study of 2,600 students. Data collection took place in spring 1991. A case study was initiated with 10 campuses to assess the appropriateness of instruction and to collect information regarding the assessment of prekindergarten students. The case study research methods included classroom observation, interviews with school staff and parents, data analysis and report writing. A campus data collection instrument was distributed to the ten campuses in the study. A contractor was selected to assist in the development and implementation of this study. A report summarizing the findings from the statewide district and campus surveys and the case study was prepared in November 1991.

Project Benefits

Several outcomes emerged from this study. The study clarified how prekindergarten has been implemented in districts. For the first time since the inception of prekindergarten in Texas in 1986, the study has provided statewide information regarding characteristics and implementation of prekindergarten programs. An in-depth examination of assessment of prekindergarten students and the developmental appropriateness of the programs has begun.

The study has begun to provide outcome data related to the impact of prekindergarten on students who did and did not participate in the program. A major benefit of the study has been the identification of guidelines developed by the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) for developmentally appropriate practices in prekindergarten programs that can be utilized by districts or campuses throughout the state. Many existing programs were unfamiliar with these guidelines.

This study also fostered a close working relationship between Agency staff and the participating districts. Participating districts in the longitudinal study and the case study strongly support and are actively involved in the evaluation. These positive relationships between the Agency and local school districts will help facilitate future collaborative efforts.

Finally, this study has served as a foundation for exploring research and evaluation activities related to prekindergarten programs. Findings from this study have raised important questions and issues such as: identification of effective prekindergarten programs, identification of assessment procedures for preschool-age children, development of cooperative relationships between agencies, and language development and limited English proficient students.

Detailed findings from this research project are provided in the report available from the Texas Education Agency Publication Office: *Texas Evaluation Study of Prekindergarten Programs: Preliminary Findings*. (November 1991).

Recommendations

Preliminary findings from the case study and statewide survey components of the prekindergarten evaluation point to the need for action in three areas: 1) providing effective staff development at both the preservice and inservice levels, particularly in the area of developmentally appropriate practices; 2) lowering prekindergarten class size; and 3) developing an early childhood education framework including specifying program quality standards by the Texas Education Agency.

INVOLVING PRINCIPALS, SUPERINTENDENTS, CENTRAL OFFICE ADMINISTRATORS, AND SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS IN THE SCHOOL ACCREDITATION PROCESS
[TEXAS SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT INITIATIVE, (TSII)]

Division: Accreditation and School Improvement
Funding: $208,000

Purpose and Major Objectives

The purposes of the project were to enhance the state's accreditation process by utilizing professional educators and school trustees in the on-site review as supplemental team members, and to improve local campus educational quality by focusing the accreditation process on student performance (outcomes) rather than exclusively on compliance to regulations. The major objectives of the TSII project were as follows:

1. To promote high standards of educational quality at the district and campus levels.
2. To strengthen the state's performance-based accreditation effort at the campus level by involving principals, superintendents, central office administrators, and school trustees as supplementary team members in on-site accreditation visits.
3. To facilitate and promote the development of a professional peer network through the school accreditation process.
4. Focus staff development and technical assistance efforts on the correlates of effective schools.

Major Activities Conducted or Services Provided

Approximately 579 TSII members participated as supplementary team members in accreditation visits to 145 school districts during the 1990-91 school year. The TSII project also carried out a major developmental training conference in Austin in July, 1990 and an unprecedented workshop training school for school board members in conjunction with a Texas Association of School Boards (TASB) conference held in Houston in October.

The summer training saw 579 participants involved in an intensive series of training workshops conducted by practitioners. The school board members' training attracted thirty-four trustees. The training focused on the correlates of effective schools and the role of the school board member in the performance-based school accreditation process.

Project Benefits

Project objectives were accomplished and the anticipated outcomes were achieved. A comprehensive survey questionnaire was sent to over 800 TSII participants attempting to describe the perceptions of TSII participants relative to three key areas: the impact of TSII training, networking opportunities, and organization and management of TSII. There were 529 surveys returned for an acceptable return rate of 66 percent. In general, the respondents appeared very pleased with the results of the TSII program. However, the responses indicated that there exists a perceived lack of coordination between the TSII staff and the state agency's accreditation staff. While this was not a condition for immediate concern, it should be rectified.

The survey statement under the *Impact of Training* section with the highest mean score (indicating the most agreement) was, "Program participation is helpful in assisting me in preparing my own district for an accreditation visit." The next highest mean score was "Program participation gave me new ideas for improving schools." Both of these highly rated statements relate directly to the objectives for TSII discussed. It was clear from the responses that the TSII participants strongly felt that the TSII training enhanced their understanding of effective schools research, motivated them to undertake improvement projects in their home districts, and expanded their knowledge base regarding effective change strategies.

In the *Networking* section of the survey, data revealed that the respondents believed TSII participation provided them and their districts with many benefits. Because of TSII program participation, the participants also were made more aware of state and regional educational issues.

Analysis of responses to the final section of the survey, *Organization and Management*, revealed that overall planning, coordination, and management of the TSII project has room for improvement in the perception of those who were at the receiving end of service delivery.

In their open-ended comments, respondents held the program in high regard. Repeated comments such as "the best thing I've ever done" appeared. There were almost no negatives regarding the overall program. A second trend was the recommendation that future training, especially for new TSII participants, should include mock interviews and role playing activities.

The evaluation results submitted by the school board members indicated that the most useful information they gained was from sources who represent the "grass roots" level of educators, especially sources from a district similar to their own.

Recommendations

Future projects of this nature need to consider providing individualized, differentiated training during all conferences in order to accommodate the various levels of understanding, training, and experience that the widely differing participants possess.

INCREASING AT-RISK GIFTED MINORITY INVOLVEMENT IN PROBLEM SOLVING SKILLS

Division: Gifted and Talented Education
Funding: $300,000

Purpose and Major Objectives

The At-Risk Minority Project of the Texas Future Problem Solving (FPS) Program constitutes an effort to stimulate academic interest and achievement in gifted and talented disadvantaged minority youth. The project's purpose is to recruit disadvantaged, gifted minority students from urban school districts that have not previously been involved in the standard FPS Program. The project is specifically designed to capture the attention and imagination of capable at-risk students. FPS provides students in grades 4-12 (organized into three division levels) with an opportunity to learn creative problem solving and critical thinking processes, practice teamwork skills, develop verbal/written competencies, and use information gathering procedures for help in problem resolution.

Major Activities Conducted or Services Provided

The project was initiated in August 1990 by a series of orientation meetings with administrators and teachers from Waco ISD and Dallas ISD, the selected school districts for 1990-91. These sessions served to introduce the project to principals and school personnel who conduct instructional programs for students identified as "gifted and talented" so that services with local instructional staff could be coordinated. Project teachers were trained in a two-day session at the Summer Coaches' Conference. On-site transition visits were conducted in October to assist coaches with implementing the program in their classrooms. One-on-one consultations were held with the project teachers after each of the three practice problems. Special preparation sessions were organized for teachers who qualified for state competition. The project culminated with the 1991 State Bowl and a final follow-up visit in May 1991 to honor the outstanding work exhibited by Waco ISD and Dallas ISD project participants. For the three 1990-91 project teams (one per FPS level) who earned International Conference at-large invitations, additional support was provided to assist teams with their international competition preparation.

Project Benefits

Number of new At-Risk Project students and teachers benefiting from the At-Risk Project during the 1990-91 school year:

Project Coaches - 20
Project Students - 80 (20 teams of 4)

Non-Project Coaches - 80 (All interested teachers were invited to training sessions.)
Non-Project Students - Approximately 1,000 This number was difficult to determine because teachers were encouraged to use the program materials with all students they instructed, not just those identified for the project.

The participating students benefited in the following ways:

- Developed creative thinking abilities.
- Increased their awareness of and interest in the future.
- Improved communication skills (both oral and written).
- Learned and utilized problem solving strategies.
- Developed and improved their research techniques.
- Developed critical and analytical thinking skills.
- Developed teamwork skills.

Classroom observations by Future Problem Solving staff and interviews with project instructors confirmed that teachers in the FPS at-risk program learned to use the FPS Program to build language arts skills in students, some for whom English was a second language.

Participation in the FPS Program required students to become active learners involved in the acquisition of information and the formulation of problem solving concepts. A major, but unexpected benefit, of program involvement was reclaiming students who were potential dropouts. Students repeatedly informed program staff that, because of FPS, they felt more self-confident and more interested in domestic and world issues. Several project teachers reported that FPS was an educational "turning point" for many at-risk youths who experienced more confidence in their ability to learn and achieve. Program involvement was a "turning point" for many project teachers as well. At the start of the project year a number of participating teachers had been skeptical about the feasibility of using the sophisticated FPS materials with at-risk students. By the school year's end, however, these teachers were expressing renewed confidence in the academic potential of their capable minority students.

Recommendations

Once trained in the Future Problem Solving method, teachers need to understand how to integrate their newly acquired skills and information into their standard curriculum. Implementation should not be viewed as one more thing teachers have to do, nor should newly acquired skills be viewed as being in conflict with "old" strategies. Immediately following FPS training, teachers need structured information that details how to fit problem solving skills and the problem solving process into instructional content areas.

PRIORITY STAFF DEVELOPMENT MODEL FOR INCREASING STUDENT MASTERY OF ACADEMIC SKILLS

Division: Special Curricular Activities
Funding: $300,00

Purpose and Major Objectives

The elementary science staff development project has the potential to (1) reach every teacher of elementary science, Grades 1-6, during a three-year period of time, (2) focus attention on appropriate use of textbook materials, (3) rely on peer training which has been proven effective, and (4) reinforce integrated curriculum alignment. This project was designed in anticipation of being continued during the 1991-92 and 1992-93 school years.

The major objectives of this project were:

1. Use a staff development module to provide systematic, comprehensive, and in-depth teacher training about revised elementary science essential elements, process science skills, and instructional methods reflected in the 1990-91 science textbook adoption.

2. Train teachers about current learning systems and help them adapt teaching behaviors to (a) improve instructional focus, integration and coordination of content, and process skills, (b) provide for individual needs, (c) increase teaching and learning success, and (d) reinforce Texas Teacher Appraisal System criteria.

3. During the spring and summer of 1991, focus teachers' attention on science process skills instruction and methods of reinforcing student acquisition of basic skills through application and transfer of learning about science to mastery of mathematics, reading and writing, social studies, and technology-related objectives.

4. Increase elementary student mastery of academic skills in science, mathematics, reading, and writing by integrating curriculum objectives and coordinating instruction with the new textbooks and supplemental materials.

5. Raise expectations of students by teaching teachers to increase student engaged time by using techniques such as discovery learning activities, cooperative learning, and student-teacher interaction as primary instructional modes.

6. Assist teachers to develop varied learning opportunities for students that address the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) objectives as part of the science instructional sequence.

Major Activities Conducted or Services Provided

Four regional Education Service Centers (ESCs), Regions IV, VI, X, and XX, received the Chapter 2 grant to conduct this project. ESC project staff and master teachers received training about use of the Title II module, entitled Texas Elementary Science Inservice Program (TESIP). ESC project staff participated in planning meetings with the Agency including training about use of the Concerns-Based Adoption Model (C-BAM) and conducted the majority of their staff development sessions for teachers. Approximately 2,130 teachers received training using the TESIP module and approximately 230 were trained as peer trainers.

Project Benefits

The primary evidence of success in this project was derived from three data sources: (1) session evaluations, scored on a scale of 1 (poor) to 7 (excellent), (2) student and teacher surveys, and (3) the Concerns Questionnaire of the C-BAM. The data in all four regions showed that the program was well received by teachers and administrators and that, even in the limited amount of time left during the spring, the staff development had an impact on classroom instruction. The data supporting these results are on file in the Special Curricular Activities office at the Texas Education Agency. Standardized achievement test data were limited to a few campuses which administer a science subtest.

The Concerns Questionnaires (C-BAM) administered before and after the staff development sessions were charted as Stages of Concern Profiles. The profiles showed an overall reduction in teacher concerns about using the new science instructional model after the training. However, all four regional profiles showed an increased concern regarding collaboration on the process skills instruction and regarding new assessment activities. It is presumed the heightened concern was due to expectations for peer training and the need for follow-up activities to reinforce new learning during implementation and prior to delivery of peer training.

Approximately 2,130 teachers and other science educators, including 230 peer trainers, participated in the Priority Staff Development Model for Increasing Mastery of Academic Skills. This number was approximately half of what was originally anticipated by the four pilot ESCs. Considering time constraints and that this was a new program, the overall success of the project was outstanding. It also served as a strong foundation for continuing the second year of the program and extending it into the other 16 regions.

Recommendations

Closer cooperation among ESCs would greatly enhance future projects designed for statewide implementation. To accomplish this, ESC staff should be invited by the Agency to participate in the needs assessment, development, and planning phases of statewide projects. Coordination of the evaluation component of this project proved beneficial to all four ESCs and the project overall.

ENHANCING THE QUALITY AND RETENTION OF MINORITY TEACHERS AND TEACHERS IN CRITICAL SHORTAGE AREAS

Division: Teacher Education
Funding: $300,00

Purpose and Major Objectives

The purpose of the project was to design, implement, and evaluate eight training programs with follow-up assistance activities for support teachers and new minority/critical shortage area teachers. A ninth project site was funded to oversee the eight local projects, to collect evaluation data across project sites, and to publish the findings of the project. The project had three major goals:

1. Design and implement a training program with a follow-up support system for enhancing the quality and retention of first-year minority/critical shortage area beginning teachers and experienced support teachers.

2. Design and implement a support network and dissemination system for continued program refinement and implementation to improve instruction and professional growth.

3. Document and study the implementation of the training/follow-up support program and the effects of that program and its products on new minority/critical teachers and their support teachers.

Major Activities Conducted or Services Provided

The project participants included: (a) three school districts, (b) three universities, (c) one regional education service center, and (d) one nonprofit educational research agency. The nonprofit educational research agency also served as the overall manager/evaluator. The targeted population consisted of approximately 705 first year teachers, 707 support teachers, and 63 administrators. A total of 1,475 educators participated in the project.

The major activities conducted by each of the eight project sites included:

1. Design and implementation of a support assistance program between experienced support teachers and first-year teachers.
2. Development of a training program, including implementation schedule, materials, etc.
3. Development of orientation materials, including brochures, newsletters and other relevant materials.
4. Design and implementation of workshop and/or seminars on curriculum and effective teaching practices.

5. Design and implementation of evaluation activities to measure program effectiveness and impact of activities and products.
6. Development of a written report containing project findings, conclusions and recommendations.

Project Benefits

Based upon available data, the eight project sites accomplished the following:

- Designed and implemented a training program for first-year minority teachers and/or teachers in critical shortage areas who were assisted by experienced support teachers.
- Designed and implemented a training program for support teachers who assisted first-year minority teachers and teachers in critical shortage areas.
- Designed and implemented a support assistance and dissemination network between and among support teachers and first-year minority and/or teachers in critical shortage areas.
- Designed and implemented evaluation activities to measure the effectiveness and impact of project activities and products.

Results of the First-Year Teacher Program Assessment Survey revealed the following:

- 70 percent of first-year teachers near the end of the year indicated their support teacher was "effective" to "very effective."
- 87 percent of first-year teachers near the end of the year reported they felt "confident" to "very confident" as a teacher.
- 49 percent of first-year teachers near the end of the year indicated that the assistance provided by their support teacher was "very helpful" to "extremely helpful."
- 48 percent of first-year teachers near the end of the year reported that they would remain in teaching throughout their careers.

Data from training program evaluation forms showed that participants rated the training they received as "excellent," "useful," and "relevant." Data on teacher retention revealed the majority of first-year teachers returned for a second year of teaching. At least 80 percent of participating first-year teachers are projected to return for a second year of teaching. Available data on teaching performance as measured by the Texas Teacher Assessment System (TTAS) revealed that the majority of first-year teachers performed at an acceptable level during their first year of teaching.

Recommendations

Projects need ample time to conduct program planning. All projects need to use the same data collection and evaluation instruments and be required to conduct follow-up activities to determine the status of individuals who participated in the project.

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY STAFF TRAINING AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR EFFECTIVE SCHOOL PROGRAMS

Division: Personnel and Staff Development
Funding: $180,000

Purpose and Major Objectives

The purpose of this project was to provide all TEA personnel who monitor school districts the opportunity to participate in supplemental inservice training on identifying effective school programs and on strategies and solutions for remedying the drop-out problem in Texas public schools. Project activities focused on bringing in national authorities on effective school programs and on programs to assist at-risk students. Additionally, Agency employees were allowed to attend more out-of-agency staff development activities in their educational disciplines.

Major Activities Conducted or Services Provided

Regarding employee participation in out-of-agency staff development and training, a total of 517 TEA employees participated in 1990-91 training sessions. A break-out of activities in which the 517 employees participated indicated that seven of the out-of-agency staff development activities were local conferences, three were statewide conferences, and forty-six were national conferences.

National authorities were brought to Austin to participate in conferences, workshops and symposiums that focused on the following topics:

a) "Students At-Risk."
b) Effective School Programs through "Site-Based Shared Decision-Making."
c) Texas Middle School Symposium.

Project Benefits

The objectives of the project were met and exceeded in the following ways:

1. 440 TEA employees were targeted for participation, 517 employees actually were served.

2. 418 TEA employees were able to attend symposiums and workshops presented by national authorities in education.

3. TEA employees were able to attend local, state, and national conferences that focused on Effective Schools, students at-risk of dropping out of school, and other related curriculum concerns.

An evaluation summary of the activities described above indicates that those types of activities are needed for agency staff to continue to grow and maintain a high level of currency in many areas of education and student learning.

Recommendations

Additional staff persons need to be funded by Chapter 2 administrative funds in order to effectively and efficiently administer the various activities associated with this project. The target population should be expanded to include technical assistance staff from the 20 Regional Education Service Centers.

INNOVATIVE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM FOR ACADEMICALLY TALENTED TEACHERS OF TOMORROW AND EXCET SKILLS TRAINING FOR TEACHERS OF TODAY

Division: Office of Support Services
Funding: $50,000

Purpose and Major Objectives

Project objectives were:

1. Provide innovative instructional programs for students identified as prospects for teacher education programs and assist them in successfully fulfilling the requirements of the Texas Academic Skills Program (TASP).
2. Coordinate and facilitate training for 100 percent of the teachers on permits who needed assistance in acquiring the necessary skills to fulfill course requirements and to pass the Elementary Comprehensive Examination for the Certification of Educators in Texas (ExCET).

Major Activities Conducted or Services Provided

Activities initiated in the spring of 1987-88 and continued through 1991 entailed: a teacher databank, teacher certification efforts, efforts to encourage career-minded students to go into the teaching profession, and a teacher-aide initiative. These activities were continued in order to support the State Board of Education's long range goal to increase the certified teacher pool from which superintendents fill their teacher vacancies. In the academic year 1990-91, 4,835 juniors and seniors were contacted to determine their interest in the teaching profession; 228 indicated an interest.

Continued in 1990-91, was the identifying and counseling of students to encourage their participation in the experimental course, Bridging the Educational Scene for Teachers of Tomorrow (BESTT). A total of 75 students enrolled in the BESTT course in 1990-91. Teachers selected to teach the course met to refine the course curriculum, plan the course evaluation, and participate in peer support and staff development.

Students (109) from the six pilot project districts participated in Texas Academic Skills Program (TASP) study sessions which consisted of 75 sessions in math, English, and language arts. Thirty-five students passed the TASP examination. To assist teachers in completing their certification requirements, a survey was conducted in the initial year (1988-89) of the project which identified 349 pilot district teachers on permits. In 1989-90 and 1990-91, an additional 122 teachers on permits were added to the list. A longitudinal study of their certification status will be completed in 1991-92.

Courses needed by the teachers on permits were analyzed and project staff met with university personnel to schedule course offerings. Five of the six pilot project districts have been designated as off-campus sites for course offerings. A longitudinal study for the 1991-92 evaluation will include the percentage and number of teachers on permits who were entered into the databank during 1988-1992 and who became certified.

During 1990-91, 50 sessions were held to prepare teachers for the Elementary Comprehensive ExCET test. Out of 315 teachers invited, 204 participated in one or more sessions and 53 percent of these passed the ExCET test. All teachers who took the ExCET had failed previous test administrations one or more times.

Project Benefits

The following accomplishments were made:

- A national teacher data bank.
- A central teacher recruitment/ certification information service.
- Collaboration among TEA, Region 1, school districts, and colleges and universities to address the teacher shortage.
- A developmental process to "grow your own" teachers.
- A teacher aide databank.
- ExCET success for many teachers.
- Increased college course offerings, including offerings at five districts' sites.
- An orientation to the teaching profession for high school students through an experimental course offering.

Recommendations

This project has been so successful in the short time of its implementation that future projects of this nature are already being planned. Five other service center regions with large numbers of teachers on permits will be replicating some or all components of this project. The state and participating school districts will fund the projects in a continued and concerted effort to increase the certified teacher pool in the state. There are two very specific features that could be incorporated into a project of this nature to further enhance its success:

1. A college support system for the BESTT and other students who enroll in a teacher education program.
2. A specific written process to facilitate international recruitment.

TEXAS PROJECT 2061, SCIENCE FOR ALL AMERICANS

Division: General Education
Funding: $25,000

Purpose and Major Objectives

Project 2061 seeks to develop a coherent kindergarten through grade 12 interdisciplinary curriculum (including science, math, technology, and social sciences) to ensure scientific literacy for all students. In addition to its primary goal of curriculum development, Project 2061 has four other major objectives:

1. Generate staff development models in the implementation of curricular change.
2. Identify effective instructional and motivational strategies for at-risk students.
3. Identify improved strategies for assessing mastery of scientific knowledge and processes, and staff training needed to implement such strategies.
4. Cultivate a new approach toward student learning of science among teachers.

Major Activities Conducted or Services Provided

The Texas Team spent the 1990-91 school year transforming the goals set forth in Science for All Americans into four major conceptual levels that describe a continuum of learning outcomes and connections. Maps have been developed for chapters in Science for All Americans emphasizing in-depth themes as opposed to survey topics. The development of a curriculum model was completed which included the following attributes: less is more, equal access, content connections (math, science, technology), constructivism (understanding how children learn), authentic assessment, scientific literacy (attitudes, skill, knowledge), "fluid" curriculum (constantly improving), variety in teaching, enhancing learning, and hands-on activities.

The Texas Elementary Science Inservice Program (TESIP), an instructional model developed with Title II Eisenhower Mathematics and Science funds, incorporates the four goals of Project 2061. Over 100 facilitators and countless elementary teachers have been trained throughout the state to use this model. The model emphasizes changing previous teacher mind-sets on how students conceptualize science.

The team worked in June at the project site and in July at Seattle, Washington with the five project teams. Working in small groups, the team was able to interact with more than 40 innovative educators and researchers. Team members have presented 104 conferences/workshops highlighting the philosophy of 2061 and the new direction of the Texas Education Agency in science education.

Over the past three years, the team has collaborated with the University of Texas at San Antonio and Austin, St. Mary's University, Incarnate Word College, Rice University, Southwest Texas State University, Texas A&M University, University of Wisconsin, and the University of Washington.

Project Benefits

The following objectives were accomplished:

1. Development of a draft curriculum model which was nationally accepted by American Academy for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) consultants and the "Blueprints for Action" Committee and is currently being revised.
2. Development of the Multiple Assessment Rotation Model (MARM).
3. Development of an instructional format for constructivism, the *Complex Instructional Model.* This format prevents student misconceptions by building on students' current knowledge.

Recommendations

Networking among the various participating groups is the key ingredient for making a project like this one successful. Sufficient time needs to be invested in appropriate staff development to ensure that new teaching models can be implemented.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

CHAPTER 2 EFFECTIVENESS EVALUATION STUDY

PARTICIPATING INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Abilene
Amarillo
Austin
Beaumont
Beeville
Brazosport
Brownsville
Conroe
Coppell
Corpus Christi
Cuero
Cypress-Fairbanks
Dallas
Denton
El Paso
Fort Bend
Fort Worth
Frost
Greenville
Harlingen
Houston
Katy
Keller
Killeen
Laredo

La Vernia
Lockhart
Livingston
Longview
Lubbock
Midland
NorthEast
Oakwood
Paradise
Paris
Pasadena
Pearland
Plano
Richardson
Rio Grande City
Roma
San Angelo
San Antonio
Stockdale
Sanford
Socorro
Texas City
Uvalde
West Orange-Cove
Wichita Falls

APPENDIX B

DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILES OF RESEARCH SAMPLE DISTRICTS

	Average Daily Attendance								
Percent Minority	>50,000	25,000-49,000	10,000-24,999	5,000-9,999	3,000-5,000	1,600-2,999	1,000-1,599	500 999	<500
50% & over	6	4	5	2	4	1			
30% - 49%		2	5	1	3			1	1
20% - 29%		2	1	1					
10% - 19%		1	2	1		2	1		1
5% - 9%		1					1		
less than 5%								1	

Sample Districts by Average Daily Attendance with Statewide Comparisons

Category	Sample		Statewide %
Over 50,000	6	(12%)	17.4%
25,000 - 49,999	10	(20%)	15.9
10,000 - 24,999	13	(26%)	23.6
5,000 - 9,999	5	(10%)	9.6
3,000 - 4,999	7	(14%)	11.6
1,600 - 2,999	3	(6%)	8.0
1,000 - 1,599	2	(4%)	5.7
500- 999	2	(4%)	4.8
under 500	2	(4%)	3.3

Sample Districts by Percent Minority with Statewide Comparisons

Category	Sample		Statewide %
50% & over	22	(44%)	46.6%
30% to under 50	13	(26%)	20.2
20% to under 30	4	(8%)	13.5
10% to under 20	8	(16%)	12.4
5% to under 10	2	(4%)	4.7
under 5%	1	(2%)	2.6

Sample Districts by Education Service Center Region with Statewide Comparisons

Region	Sample		Statewide %
I	5	(10%)	7.1%
II	2	(4%)	3.4
III	1	(2%)	1.7
IV	8	(16%)	20.2
V	2	(4%)	2.6
VI	4	(8%)	3.1
VII	1	(2%)	4.7
VIII	1	(2%)	1.7
IX	1	(2%)	1.2
X	5	(10%)	13.1
XI	4	(8%)	8.9
XII	2	(4%)	3.4
XIII	2	(4%)	5.8
XIV	1	(2%)	1.5
XV	1	(2%)	1.5
XVI	2	(4%)	2.3
XVII	1	(2%)	2.6
XVIII	1	(2%)	2.4
XIX	2	(4%)	4.1
XX	5	(10%)	8.6

APPENDIX C

LETTER AND INSTRUCTIONS MAILED TO PARTICIPATING SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Texas
Education
Agency

1701 NORTH CONGRESS AVENUE AUSTIN, TEXAS 78701-1494 (512) 463-9734

March 7, 1991

ACTION REQUIRED

TO THE SUPERINTENDENT ADDRESSED:

SUBJECT: 1990-91 CHAPTER 2 COMPREHENSIVE EFFECTIVENESS EVALUATION

Your district was notified in December that it had been selected to participate in a comprehensive evaluation of the effectiveness of projects funded under the authority of ESEA Chapter 2 for school year 1990-91. This comprehensive evaluation is mandated under Public Law 100-297 for the purpose of providing information to the U.S. Department of Education which will summarize the data from all fifty states for the U.S. Congress. The Congress will use these data during its consideration of the reauthorization of Chapter 2 legislation in 1993.

Your district is one among a representative sample of fifty independent school districts that are participating in this important evaluation project. The data being requested of your district for this project are in addition to, not a substitution for, the evaluation data your district will submit to the Agency this year for Chapter 2 formula programs that were funded through the Standard Application System. These additional evaluation data being requested of you in this correspondence are required of your district for the 1990-91 school year only.

These additional data requirements have been kept at the minimum level acceptable to meet the federal requirements. I appreciate the extra effort that participating in this project will require from your staff, but continued funding of Chapter 2 is conditioned on supplying these additional evaluation data.

Please find enclosed a package of materials to assist you in conducting the comprehensive evaluation of your Chapter 2-sponsored programs. Please give these materials to the person who is most familiar with the Chapter 2-sponsored programs in your district. A stamped/self-addressed envelope has been enclosed for you to provide the Agency with the name of a contact person for this evaluation project.

The district is responsible for making any additional copies of the enclosed data collection forms.

The deadline for submitting the data report forms to the Agency is June 30, 1991.

Please inspect the enclosed materials to ensure that you have received all of the items listed below:

- District Chapter 2 Contact Form - return to Agency as soon as possible
- Return envelope addressed to Texas Education Agency
- General Instructions
- Data forms for your Chapter 2 Targeted Area:
    - Special Instructions
    - Cover page
    - Data forms
    - Program Synopsis page

Please direct all questions about the Chapter 2 Comprehensive Effectiveness Evaluation Project to the Division of Program Evaluation at (512) 463-9524.

Thank you for your cooperation in this important study.

Sincerely,

Stephen Lewis

Stephen Lewis
Division of Program Evaluation

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY

CHAPTER 2 COMPREHENSIVE EFFECTIVENESS EVALUATION REPORT FOR SCHOOL YEAR 1990-91

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

The emphasis of this evaluation study is on the effectiveness of Chapter 2-sponsored programs. This information is being collected in order to provide supportive evidence to Congress that Chapter 2 funds are having a positive effect on local schools.

Enclosed are the data forms for conducting the 1990-91 comprehensive effectiveness evaluation of your district's Chapter 2-sponsored programs. You need only conduct evaluation for the targeted areas specified below:

- Direct Services for Students At-Risk
- Innovative Programs

Please inspect the enclosed materials to ensure that you have received all of the items listed below:

- District Chapter 2 Contact Form - **return immediately**
- Return envelope addressed to Texas Education Agency
- Data forms for each Targeted Area:
  - Special Instructions
  - Cover page
  - Data forms
  - Program Synopsis page

DEFINITIONS FOR THIS REPORT

At-risk Students - Use your district's definition of "at-risk" students and the mandatory definition described in the Texas Administrative Code and the Texas Education Code.

Observed Outcomes - Those changes in students and, or staff in the areas of knowledge, attitudes, and behavior which can be attributed in whole or in part to the programs/activities funded with Chapter 2 monies.

Available Data - We are especially interested in summary reports or comparative compilation of data (charts, graphs, etc.). Please do not send individual tests or survey questionnaires except as samples of your evaluation methods. Do describe what documentation you have available, or will have available, in 1991. You may be asked to provide copies of summary documentation at a later date.

EVALUATION ACTIVITIES TO BE CONDUCTED

1. Complete the enclosed data collection instrument(s) for each targeted area. The forms should be completed after the Chapter 2 activity is completed and after you have finished any local evaluation of your program's effectiveness.

2. Distribute, if necessary, copies of the appropriate data collection instruments to a campus, or campuses where your Chapter 2 program has been implemented and is being conducted.

3. Collect, if appropriate, the completed campus level data collection instruments from each campus and review them for accuracy. Once the campus data collection instruments have been collected and verified, please return both the district level data collection instrument and the campus level data collection instrument to the Agency.

4. Tabulate campus level data and submit summary data report form with other materials.

5. Complete the "Program Synopsis" page. This page must be typewritten. This item is meant to stand alone as a brief, narrative description of your program. These one-page descriptions will be compiled into the final report and may be provided to legislative staff.

DEADLINE FOR RETURNING MATERIALS

Return materials to the Agency by June 30, 1991. If your Chapter 2 program extends into the Summer, please call the Division of Program Evaluation for an alternative deadline date. Please ensure that you return the following materials:

Cover Page
Data forms
Data summary sheet (if appropriate)
Program Synopsis page (typewritten)
Additional data summary reports, questionnaires, other attachments (optional)

Mail to:
Texas Education Agency
Division of Program Evaluation - Chapter 2
1701 N. Congress Ave.
Austin, TX 78701

Please mail the Chapter 2 District Contact sheet as soon as possible.

FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE CALL: (512) 463-9524

District Name ______________________ County-Dist. No. ______________________

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY

CHAPTER 2 COMPREHENSIVE EFFECTIVENESS EVALUATION REPORT FOR SCHOOL YEAR 1990-91

DISTRICT CONTACT PERSON

Please provide the following information so the Agency can have a contact person for the effectiveness evaluation:

Name: ______________________

Position: ______________________

Address: ______________________

Phone #: ______________________

Return this sheet in the stamped, self-addressed envelope addressed to Texas Education Agency that was provided to your district, or mail to:

Texas Education Agency
Division of Program Evaluation (Chapter 2)
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701-1494

APPENDIX D

SURVEY RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY

CHAPTER 2 COMPREHENSIVE EFFECTIVENESS EVALUATION REPORT FOR SCHOOL YEAR 1990-91

TARGETED AREA: DIRECT SERVICES FOR AT-RISK STUDENTS

INSTRUCTIONS

- This form should be completed by the person in your district who is most familiar with the implementation of the Chapter 2 sponsored program(s) that provides direct services to at-risk students.
- If your at-risk program targets students at campuses district-wide, please check "District-wide program" in the space provided on page 1.
- If your program served students only at one or two specific campuses, or at a special facility, please check "Campus or special facility program" in the space provided on page 1. Please give the attached data forms to the person at the campus or facility who is most familiar with the personal excellence program.
- The last page of these forms asks for a "Program Synopsis". This form must be typed.
- You may submit any available data you have that contributes to information about the effectiveness of your Chapter 2 program.
- Deadline for returning completed forms is June 30, 1991.
- If your program lasts through the summer, please contact the Agency for an alternative deadline date.

Return the cover page, data forms, "Program Synopsis", and any attachments to:

Texas Education Agency
Division of Program Evaluation (Chapter 2)
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701-1494

For technical assistance, please call: (512) 463-9524.

District Name	County-Dist. No.
Campus Name	Campus Number

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY

CHAPTER 2 COMPREHENSIVE EFFECTIVENESS EVALUATION REPORT FOR SCHOOL YEAR 1990-91

TARGETED AREA: DIRECT SERVICES FOR AT-RISK STUDENTS

Report Prepared By: ______________________________
Position: ______________________________
Address: ______________________________
Phone #: ______________________________

Return the following items:

- Cover page
- Data forms
- Program Synopsis
- Attachments

Mail to:

Texas Education Agency
Division of Program Evaluation (Chapter 2)
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701-1494

For technical assistance, please call:
Division of Program Evaluation
(512) 463-9524.

______________________ District Name

______________________ County-Dist. No.

______________________ Campus Name

______________________ Campus Number

CHAPTER 2 COMPREHENSIVE EFFECTIVENESS EVALUATION REPORT FOR SCHOOL YEAR 1990-91

TARGETED AREA: DIRECT SERVICES FOR AT-RISK STUDENTS

______ **District-wide program.**

______ **Campus or special facility program.**

PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS DATA

1. Check each of the areas below that apply to your Chapter 2 program for at-risk students:

    _____ the program entails changes to one or more of the district's regular curricula (e.g., mathematics, science) in order to assist "at-risk" students academically

    _____ the program offers a new social service to assist at-risk students in improving their school-related attitudes and behavior

    _____ the program enhances or enriches an existing social service to assist at-risk students in improving their school-related attitudes and behavior

    _____ the program entails staff development and training to assist district personnel to better understand and serve at-risk students

    _____ the program entails activities aimed at increasing involvement and participation of the parents of at-risk students

    _____ the program entails activities aimed at increasing community awareness, involvement, and/or participation to assist at-risk students

    ______ Other (please specify):______________________________________

2. To what extent was the program implemented? (Circle your response)

    a. program was not implemented
    b. program was partially implemented
    c. program completely implemented as planned
    d. program was implemented as planned and expanded beyond the original scope of the progam

_________________________ District Name

_________________________ County-Dist. No.

3. If the program was not implemented, or only partially implemented, briefly explain why. (Attach another sheet if necessary)

4. What data sources have been used, or are being used presently, to determine if your Chapter 2 at-risk program outcomes are being met? (Check all that apply)

_____ Classroom observations
_____ Teacher/staff surveys (interviews, questionnaires)
_____ Parent surveys (interviews, questionnaires)
_____ Student surveys (interviews, questionnaires)
_____ Student products (portfolios)
_____ School records
_____ Standardized achievement tests
_____ Locally developed tests
_____ Other (please specify)____

5. Below is a list of possible observed outcomes that may be attributed to an effective Chapter 2 program for at-risk students. (Please check all outcomes for which your district has evidence)

_____ improved achievement test scores
_____ improved grades
_____ improved attendance
_____ improved classroom participation
_____ improved attitudes about school
_____ improved conduct
_____ improved use of instructional/educational materials
_____ improved promotion rate
_____ improved graduation rate
_____ improved parental involvement/awareness
_____ improved community involvement/awareness
_____ improved teacher interest/awareness of at-risk students' needs
_____ improved staff interest/awareness of at-risk students' needs
_____ improved administrative response to the needs of at-risk students
_____ other (please specify)____

6. What specific documentation can you provide to support the observed outcomes indicated in Question #5 above? (Please refer to the General Instructions sent to your district's Chapter 2 contact person)

____
____

______________________ ______________________

District Name County-Dist. No.

7. If you have existing information already available or that will be available on or before June 30, 1991, then provide the following data for those students who actually participated in the chapter 2-sponsored program or who were targeted by the program:

Number students showed improvement in test grades ______
Number students promoted (expected for 1991) ______
Number students retained (expected for 1991) ______
Number students showed improvement in discipline ______
Number students showed increased classroom participation ______
Number students showed improved attendance ______

8. Total number of 1990-91 students identified as "at-risk" in the district. ______

9. Total number of at-risk students served or targeted by this project by grade level.

Pre-K - 5 ______

6 - 8 ______

9 - 12 ______

10. Total number of staff actively involved in this Chapter 2 program. ______

11. Total number of staff that received special training/professional development for working with the at-risk students in this project. ______

Narrative Component:
Describe briefly the greatest contribution, or asset, to your district made possible by the existence of Chapter 2 funds.

(PLEASE COMPLETE THE PROGRAM SYNOPSIS FORM ON THE NEXT PAGE)

District Name ____________________ County-Dist. No. ________________

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY

CHAPTER 2 COMPREHENSIVE EFFECTIVENESS EVALUATION
FOR SCHOOL YEAR 1990-91

PROGRAM SYNOPSIS

TARGETED AREA: DIRECT SERVICES FOR AT-RISK STUDENTS

Project Title ____

Amount of Funds for Project __________ Campus______ District-wide______

Number of Students Targeted __________ Number Staff Involved______

Grade Levels Targeted ______________

(Responses must be typed)

1. General description of the program and activities conducted.

2. Major objectives of the program; outcomes expected.

3. Describe those benefits to students and staff members that have been made possible through the Chapter 2-sponsored project that otherwise would not have been available. Include evidence of effectiveness by citing accomplishments and providing indications of positive outcomes.

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY

CHAPTER 2 COMPREHENSIVE EFFECTIVENESS EVALUATION REPORT FOR SCHOOL YEAR 1990-91

TARGETED AREA: STAFF DEVELOPMENT

INSTRUCTIONS: There are two separate forms for evaluating the Chapter 2-sponsored staff development programs.

1. **DISTRICT LEVEL FORM** - This form should be completed by the person in your district who is most familiar with the district-wide implementation of the Chapter 2-sponsored staff development and professional training programs.

The last page of this form is a "Program Synopsis" which must be typed.

2. **CAMPUS LEVEL FORM** - Duplicate this form as needed and distribute only to teachers who participated in staff development sessions funded by Chapter 2 during 1990-91. Tabulate the results and submit a summary report using the form attached (Attachment 1). Keep the individual survey forms that were filled out by your staff at your central office.

   SAMPLING: If you have more than 100 teachers who participated in Chapter 2 staff development sessions, then distribute the campus level survey form to a random sample of 100 participants. If teachers from different campuses are involved, include teachers from each of those campuses. If you need additional information and assistance regarding your sampling procedures, please see the telephone number provided at the bottom of these instructions.

   USE AVAILABLE DATA: If your district uses an existing instrument for surveying the participants of Chapter 2 staff development sessions (including teachers and/or other staff), then submit a report that summarizes the findings of those surveys. You may submit that summary report in the place of the summary report form that is attached. Attach a copy of your district's survey instrument (questionnaire) to the summary report.

Deadline for returning completed forms is June 30, 1991.

If your staff development sessions extend through the summer, please contact the Agency for an alternative deadline date.

Return the following items to the address below: Cover page, Data forms, Data summary report, Program Synopsis, Attachments

Texas Education Agency
Division of Program Evaluation (Chapter 2)
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701-1494

For technical assistance, please call: (512) 463-9524.

District Name ______________________ County-Dist. No. ______________________

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY

CHAPTER 2 COMPREHENSIVE EFFECTIVENESS EVALUATION REPORT FOR SCHOOL YEAR 1990-91

TARGETED AREA: STAFF DEVELOPMENT

DISTRICT LEVEL FORM

Report Prepared By: ______________________
Position: ______________________
Address: ______________________
Phone #: ______________________

Return the following items to the Agency:

- Cover page
- Data forms
- Program Synopsis
- Attachments

Mail to:

Texas Education Agency
Division of Program Evaluation (Chapter 2)
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701-1494

For technical assistance, please call:
Division of Program Evaluation
(512) 463-9524.

District Name ____________________

County-Dist. No. ____________________

CHAPTER 2 COMPREHENSIVE EFFECTIVENESS EVALUATION REPORT FOR SCHOOL YEAR 1990-91

TARGETED AREA: STAFF DEVELOPMENT

DISTRICT LEVEL FORM

1. Indicate the number of persons who participated in the training and/or professional development activities according to the categories listed below:

Principals	____
Teachers	____
Counselors	____
Teachers' Aides	____
District Central Office Staff	____
Board Members	____
Parents	____
Total Participants	____

2. Indicate how training was provided.
(Check all that apply)

____ by district personnel
____ through the Education Service Center
____ by public, non-profit training staff
____ by private company training staff
____ other (specify) ____________________

3. Which of the following training formats were used?
(Check all that apply)

____ workshop
____ conference
____ inservice course
____ higher education course
____ seminar/lecture
____ independent study
____ other (specify) ____________________

4. Estimate what percentage of your Chapter 2 funded staff development programs was targeted for improving skills and knowledge of the staff working with at-risk students. ____%

_______________________ District Name

_______________________ County-Dist. No.

5. To what degree was the staff development program implemented?

____ a. program was not implemented
____ b. program was partially implemented
____ c. program was implemented as planned
____ d. program was implemented as planned and expanded beyond the original design.

6. If the program was not implemented, or only partially implemented, briefly describe why. (Attach another sheet if necessary)

7. Check the categories which describe your Chapter 2 staff development programs.

____ Adoption and refinement of instructional techniques
____ Implementation of new programs into content areas
____ Development of curriculum goals and objectives
____ Instructional leadership and supervision
____ Development of curriculum materials
____ Development of a knowledge base in the subject areas.
____ Knowledge and application of computer technology (hardware and software) for instruction

8. Which of the following student outcomes were observed that can be attributed to the Chapter 2 Staff Development programs? (Check all that apply)

____ improved student grades
____ improved student attendance
____ improved classroom participation
____ improved student attitudes about school
____ improved student conduct
____ other student outcomes ________________________________

9. What specific documentation can you provide to support the observed outcomes indicated in Question #8 above? (Please refer to the General Instructions sent to your district's Chapter 2 contact person)

____
____
____

______________________ ______________________
District Name County-Dist. No.

10. For which of the following staff development outcomes do you have documentation that you can provide to support evidence of effectiveness? (Check all that apply)

____ Participants indicated sessions were relevant to their work
____ Staff learned what was presented
____ Staff applied their acquired knowledge to their current position (e.g., in the classroom; in the office)
____ Staff demonstrated measurable increases in knowledge and/or skills
____ Staff demonstrated increases in awareness of the needs of at-risk students
____ Staff demonstrated improved attitudes

11. What data sources have been used, or are being used presently, to document the outcomes listed in Question #10 above? (Check all that apply)

____ Participant survey questionnaires
____ Participant interviews
____ Classroom observations
____ Student surveys (interviews, questionnaires)
____ Other (please specify)______________________________

12. Provide any existing summary reports you have that discuss the data collected with the documents you checked off in Question #11 above.

Narrative Component:

Briefly describe the greatest contribution, or asset, to your district made possible by the existence of Chapter 2 funds?

(PLEASE COMPLETE THE PROGRAM SYNOPSIS FORM ON THE NEXT PAGE)

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY

District Name County-Dist. No.

Campus Name Campus Number

CHAPTER 2 COMPREHENSIVE EFFECTIVENESS EVALUATION REPORT

TARGETED AREA: STAFF DEVELOPMENT

DISTRICT LEVEL FORM:

TEACHER PARTICIPANT QUESTIONNAIRE

Instructions:

Complete this questionnaire only if you participated in 1990-91 Chapter 2-sponsored staff training/professional development sessions. All information will be confidential and will not be used for any purposes other than for the effectiveness evaluation of Chapter 2.

Please answer the following questions about the effectiveness of the training you received. Using the scale below, circle your response.

1 - Not at all
2 - A small amount
3 - A moderate amount
4 - A Great Deal
NA (not applicable)

1. To what extent did the activity provide information or skills training that had practical application to your particular work?	1	2	3	4	NA
2. To what extent have the knowledge and skills acquired been implemented or used in your current position?	1	2	3	4	NA
3. To what extent have the knowledge and skills you acquired contributed to improvement in the instructional program?	1	2	3	4	NA
4. To what extent have the knowledge and skills you acquired contributed to improvement in your students' academic performance?	1	2	3	4	NA
5. To what extent have the knowledge and skills you acquired contributed to improvement in your students' behavior or attitudes?	1	2	3	4	NA

RETURN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE TO YOUR DISTRICT'S CHAPTER 2 CONTACT PERSON

District Name ____________ County-Dist. No. ____________

Campus Name ____________ Campus Number ____________

CHAPTER 2 COMPREHENSIVE EFFECTIVENESS EVALUATION REPORT

TARGETED AREA: STAFF DEVELOPMENT

DISTRICT LEVEL: SUMMARY REPORT FORM

INSTRUCTIONS: Report the data collected from teachers who were surveyed with the Participant Questionnaire that was sent to the district.

Total number of teachers who completed the Participant Questionnaire. ________

Item Tabulation

Question 1. Number of teachers who circled '1' ________
Number of teachers who circled '2' ________
Number of teachers who circled '3' ________
Number of teachers who circled '4' ________
Number of teachers who circled 'NA' ________

Question 2. Number of teachers who circled '1' ________
Number of teachers who circled '2' ________
Number of teachers who circled '3' ________
Number of teachers who circled '4' ________
Number of teachers who circled 'NA ________

Question 3. Number of teachers who circled '1' ________
Number of teachers who circled '2' ________
Number of teachers who circled '3' ________
Number of teachers who circled '4' ________
Number of teachers who circled 'NA ________

Question 4. Number of teachers who circled '1' ________
Number of teachers who circled '2' ________
Number of teachers who circled '3' ________
Number of teachers who circled '4' ________
Number of teachers who circled 'NA ________

Question 5. Number of teachers who circled '1' ________
Number of teachers who circled '2' ________
Number of teachers who circled '3' ________
Number of teachers who circled '4' ________
Number of teachers who circled 'NA ________

For technical assistance, please call:
Division of Program Evaluation
(512) 463-9524.

District Name ____________________ County-Dist. No. ________________

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY

CHAPTER 2 COMPREHENSIVE EFFECTIVENESS EVALUATION
FOR SCHOOL YEAR 1990-91

PROGRAM SYNOPSIS

TARGETED AREA: STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Project Title ____
Amount of Funds for Project ___________ Campus_______ District-wide______
Number of Students Targeted ___________ Number Staff Involved_______
Grade Levels Targeted _________________

(Responses must be typed)

1. General description of the program and activities conducted.

2. Major objectives of the program; outcomes expected.

3. Describe those benefits to students and staff members that have been made possible through the Chapter 2-sponsored project that otherwise would not have been available. Include evidence of effectiveness by citing accomplishments and providing indications of positive outcomes.

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY

CHAPTER 2 COMPREHENSIVE EFFECTIVENESS EVALUATION REPORT FOR SCHOOL YEAR 1990-91

TARGETED AREA: EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS

INSTRUCTIONS

- This form should be completed by the person in your district who is most familiar with the implementation of the Chapter 2-sponsored Effective Schools program.
- If your program targeted students at several campuses district-wide, please check "District-wide program" in the space provided on page 1.
- If your program served students only at one or two specific campuses, or at a special facility, please check "Campus or special facility program" in the space provided on page 1. Please give the attached data forms to the person at the campus or facility who is most familiar with the Effective Schools program.
- **Submit Available Data**: If your district uses any existing instruments for evaluating your Chapter 2 program's effectiveness, (e.g., surveys of teachers or students) please attach a report that summarizes your data. This report would be an addition to, not a substitute for, the enclosed data forms. Please attach a copy of any data collection instrument from which you report data.
- The last page of these forms asks for a "Program Synopsis". This form must be typed.

Deadline for returning completed forms is June 30, 1991.

If your program lasts through the summer, please contact the Agency for an alternative deadline date.

Return this cover page, the data forms, Program Synopsis, and any attachments to:

Texas Education Agency
Division of Program Evaluation (Chapter 2)
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701-1494

For technical assistance, please call: (512) 463-9524.

District Name	County-Dist. No.
Campus Name	Campus Number

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY

CHAPTER 2 COMPREHENSIVE EFFECTIVENESS EVALUATION REPORT
FOR SCHOOL YEAR 1990-91

TARGETED AREA: EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS

Report Prepared By: ______
Position: ______
Address: ______
Phone #: ______

Return the following items to the Texas Education Agency:

- Cover page
- Data forms
- Program Synopsis
- Attachments

Mail to:

Texas Education Agency
Division of Program Evaluation (Chapter 2)
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701-1494

For technical assistance, please call:
Division of Program Evaluation
(512) 463-9524.

______________________ District Name

______________________ County-Dist. No.

______________________ Campus Name

______________________ Campus Number

CHAPTER 2 COMPREHENSIVE EFFECTIVENESS EVALUATION REPORT
FOR SCHOOL YEAR 1990-91

TARGETED AREA: EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS

______ **District-wide program.**

______ **Campus or special facility program.**

PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS DATA

1. Indicate the major areas targeted by your district's Chapter 2-sponsored Effective Schools program:

    ____ Staff training
    ____ Technical assistance
    ____ Parent-community participation
    ____ Evaluation - of student achievement, performance, participation
    ____ Other (explain).
    ____
    ____

2. Indicate the total number of schools in your district. _____

3. How many of these schools are substantially involved in this Effective Schools Chapter 2 program? ______

4. How many 1990-91 students are being (or will be) served or targeted by this program? ______

5. What grade levels are being served or targeted?

    _____ Pre-K
    _____ K - 5
    _____ 6 - 8
    _____ 9 - 12

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

____________________ District Name

________________________ County-Dist. No.

6. What types of students are being (or will be) served by this program? (Check all that apply)

_____ At-risk
_____ Gifted
_____ Regular/Mainstream
_____ Other (please specify) _________________

7. To what extent was the Effective Schools program implemented? (Circle your response)

a. program was not implemented
b. program was partially implemented
c. program was implemented as planned
d. program was implemented as planned and was expanded beyond the original design

8. If the program was not implemented, or only partially implemented, briefly explain why. (Attach another sheet if necessary)

9. What type of data sources are being used presently to determine if the outcomes of your Chapter 2 Effective Schools program are being met? (Check all that apply)

____ Teacher/staff surveys (interviews, questionnaires)
____ Student surveys (interviews, questionnaires)
____ Student products (portfolios, etc.)
____ Parent surveys (interviews, questionnaires)
____ Classroom observations
____ School records
____ Standardized achievement tests
____ Locally developed tests
____ Other (please specify)_______________________________________

____________________	________________________
District Name	County-Dist. No.

10. Below is a list of possible observed outcomes that may be attributed to a successful Chapter 2 Effective Schools program (Please check all outcomes for which your district has evidence)

____ improved grades
____ improved attendance
____ improved classroom participation
____ improved use of instructional/learning materials
____ improved attitudes about school
____ improved student conduct
____ improved promotion rate
____ improved graduation rate
____ improved achievement test scores
____ other (please specify) ______________________

11. What specific documentation can you provide to support the observed outcomes indicated in Question #10 above? (Please refer to the General Instructions sent to your district's Chapter 2 contact person)

____
____
____

Use the scale below to indicate to what extent Chapter 2 funds have contributed to any of the following areas that apply to your district's schoolwide improvement/effective schools programs. (Circle your response)

1 - No contribution
2 - A small contribution
3 - A moderate contribution
4 - A great contribution
NA - Not Applicable; no opinion

1. School-level planning.	1	2	3	4	NA
2. Instructional improvement.	1	2	3	4	NA
3. Staff development.	1	2	3	4	NA
4. Increasing academic achievement of all students.	1	2	3	4	NA

District Name ____________________ County-Dist. No. ________________________

5. Increasing academic achievement of at-risk students.	1	2	3	4	NA
6. Effective instructional leadership.	1	2	3	4	NA
7. Organizational capacity for instructional problem solving.	1	2	3	4	NA
8. A climate of high expectations for students.	1	2	3	4	NA
9. Continuous/effective assessment of students.	1	2	3	4	NA
10. Programs to evaluate effects of instructional programs.	1	2	3	4	NA
11. A safe and orderly school environment.	1	2	3	4	NA
12. Emphasis on acquiring basic and higher order skills.	1	2	3	4	NA
13. Parent and community involvement.	1	2	3	4	NA
14. Other (write in) ______________________	1	2	3	4	NA

______________________ ______________________
District Name County-Dist. No.

Narrative Description of Chapter 2 Project Effectiveness

Title of Project:____

1. Describe how your Chapter 2-sponsored "effective schools" project has been successfully integrated with your district's existing effective schools program.

2. Describe and provide examples of how your Chapter 2-sponsored project(s) has enabled your district to accomplish the goals and objectives of your district's Effective Schools program.

3. Describe those benefits to students and staff members that have been made possible through the Chapter 2-sponsored project that otherwise would not have been available. Include evidence of effectiveness by citing accomplishments and providing indications of positive outcomes. You may attach materials, booklets, photographs, etc.

4. Describe briefly the greatest contribution, or asset, to your district made possible by the existence of Chapter 2 funds.

(PLEASE COMPLETE THE PROGRAM SYNOPSIS FORM ON THE NEXT PAGE)

District Name ______________________ County-Dist. No. ______________________

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY

CHAPTER 2 COMPREHENSIVE EFFECTIVENESS EVALUATION
FOR SCHOOL YEAR 1990-91

PROGRAM SYNOPSIS

TARGETED AREA: EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS

Project Title ____
Amount of Funds for Project ____________ Campus________ District-wide______
Number of Students Targeted ____________ Number Staff Involved________
Grade Levels Targeted ____________________

(Responses must be typed)

1. **General description of the program and activities conducted.**

2. **Major objectives of the program; outcomes expected.**

3. **Describe those benefits to students and staff members that have been made possible through the Chapter 2-sponsored project that otherwise would not have been available. Include evidence of effectiveness by citing accomplishments and providing indications of positive outcomes.**

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY

CHAPTER 2 COMPREHENSIVE EFFECTIVENESS EVALUATION REPORT FOR SCHOOL YEAR 1990-91

TARGETED AREA: PERSONAL EXCELLENCE & ACHIEVEMENT

INSTRUCTIONS

- This form should be completed by the person in your district who is most familiar with the implementation of the Chapter 2-sponsored program(s) that provides direct services for personal excellence of students.
- If your personal excellence program targets students at campuses district-wide, check "District-wide program" in the space provided on page 1 of the data form.
- If your program served students only at one or two specific campuses, or at a special facility, please check "Campus or special facility program" in the space provided on page 1. Please give the attached data forms to the person at the campus or facility who is most familiar with the personal excellence program.
- **The last page of these forms asks for a "Program Synopsis". This form must be typed.**
- **Submit Available Data**: If your district uses any existing instruments for evaluating your Chapter 2 program's effectiveness, (e.g., surveys of teachers or students) please attach a report that summarizes your data. This report would be an addition to, not a substitute for, the enclosed data forms. Please attach a copy of any data collection instrument from which you report data.
- **Deadline for returning completed forms is June 30, 1991.**
- **If your program extends through the summer, please contact the Agency for an alternative deadline date.**

Return the cover page, data forms, Program Synopsis, and any attachments to:

Texas Education Agency
Division of Program Evaluation (Chapter 2)
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701-1494

For technical assistance, please call: (512) 463-9524.

District Name	County-Dist. No.
Campus Name	Campus Number

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY

CHAPTER 2 COMPREHENSIVE EFFECTIVENESS EVALUATION REPORT FOR SCHOOL YEAR 1990-91

TARGETED AREA: PERSONAL EXCELLENCE & ACHIEVEMENT

Report Prepared By: ____________________
Position: ____________________
Address: ____________________
Phone #: ____________________

Return the following items:

- Cover page
- Data forms
- Program Synopsis
- Attachments

Mail to:

Texas Education Agency
Division of Program Evaluation (Chapter 2)
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701-1494

For technical assistance, please call:
Division of Program Evaluation
(512) 463-9524.

______________________	______________________
District Name	County-Dist. No.
______________________	______________________
Campus Name	Campus Number

CHAPTER 2 COMPREHENSIVE EFFECTIVENESS EVALUATION REPORT FOR SCHOOL YEAR 1990-91

TARGETED AREA: PERSONAL EXCELLENCE & ACHIEVEMENT

______ **District-wide program.**

______ **Campus or special facility program.**

PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS DATA

1. How is your Personal Excellence program offered to students?

   ______ regular school year
   ______ summer program only
   ______ regular school year and summer program

2. How many 1990-91 students are being (or will be) served or targeted by this project? ______

3. What grade levels are being served or targeted?

   _____ Pre-K
   _____ K - 5
   _____ 6 - 8
   _____ 9 - 12

4. What types of students are being (or will be) served by this program? (Check all that apply)

   _____ At-risk
   _____ Gifted
   _____ Disadvantaged
   _____ Handicapped
   _____ Regular/Mainstream
   _____ Other (please specify) ________________

5. To what extent was the program implemented? (Circle your response)

   a. program was not implemented
   b. program was partially implemented
   c. program was implemented as planned
   d. program was implemented as planned and was expanded beyond original design

______________________ ______________________
District Name County-Dist. No.

6. If the program was not implemented, or only partially implemented, briefly explain why. (Attach another sheet if necessary.)

7. What data sources are being used presently to determine if the outcomes of your Chapter 2 Personal Excellence program are being met? (Check all that apply)

____ Classroom observations
____ Teacher/staff surveys (interviews, questionnaires)
____ Student surveys (interviews, questionnaires)
____ Parent surveys (interviews, questionnaires)
____ Student products (portfolios)
____ School records
____ Standardized achievement tests
____ Locally developed tests
____ Other (please specify)______________________________________

8. Below is a list of possible observed outcomes that may be attributed to an effective Chapter 2 Personal Excellence program. (Please check all outcomes for which your district has evidence)

____ improved grades
____ improved attendance
____ improved classroom participation
____ improved use of instructional/learning materials
____ improved attitudes about school
____ improved student conduct
____ improved promotion rate
____ improved graduation rate
____ improved achievement test scores
____ other (please specify) ______________________

9. What specific documentation can you provide to support the observed outcomes indicated in #8 above? (Please refer to the General Instructions sent to your district's Chapter 2 contact person)

____
____
____
____

District Name ____________________ County-Dist. No. ____________________

10. If you have existing information already available or that will be available on or before June 30, 1991, then provide the following data for those students who actually participated in the Chapter 2 personal excellence program:

Number of students showed increased classroom participation _____
Number of students showed improvement in discipline _____
Number of students showed improved attendance _____
Number of students showed improved grades _____
Number of students showed improved attitudes _____

11. Total number of staff actively involved in this Chapter 2 program. _____

12. Total number of staff who received special training and/or professional development for working with the students in this Chapter 2 project. _____

13. Please provide other evidence and/or information that indicates how student performance objectives were achieved. For example, a report on students' participation in a science fair. Attach another sheet if necessary.

Narrative Component:
Describe briefly the greatest contribution, or asset, to your district made possible by the existence of Chapter 2 funds.

(PLEASE COMPLETE THE PROGRAM SYNOPSIS FORM ON THE NEXT PAGE)

District Name ____________________ County-Dist. No. ____________________

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY

CHAPTER 2 COMPREHENSIVE EFFECTIVENESS EVALUATION 1990-91
FOR SCHOOL YEAR 1990-91

PROGRAM SYNOPSIS

TARGETED AREA: PERSONAL EXCELLENCE & ACHIEVEMENT

Project Title ____

Amount of Funds for Project ___________ Campus_______ District-wide______

Number of Students Targeted ___________ Number Staff Involved_______

Grade Levels Targeted _________________

(Responses must be typed)

1. General description of the program and activities conducted.

2. Major objectives of the program; outcomes expected.

3. Describe those benefits to students and staff members that have been made possible through the Chapter 2-sponsored project that otherwise would not have been available. Include evidence of effectiveness by citing accomplishments and providing indications of positive outcomes.

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY

CHAPTER 2 COMPREHENSIVE EFFECTIVENESS EVALUATION REPORT FOR SCHOOL YEAR 1990-91

TARGETED AREA: INNOVATIVE PROJECTS

INSTRUCTIONS

- This form should be completed by the person in your district who is most familiar with the implementation of the Chapter 2-sponsored Innovative Project.
- If your program targeted students at several campuses district-wide, please check "District-wide program" in the space provided on page 1 of the data form.
- If your program served students only at one or two specific campuses, or at a special facility, please check "Campus or special facility program" in the space provided on page 1. Please give the attached data forms to the person at the campus or facility who is most familiar with the personal excellence program.
- **The last page of these forms asks for a "Program Synopsis". This form must be typed.**
- **Submit Available Data:** If your district uses any existing instruments for evaluating your Chapter 2 program's effectiveness, (e.g., surveys of teachers or students) please attach a report that summarizes your data. This report would be an addition to, not a substitute for, the enclosed data forms. Please attach a copy of any data collection instrument from which you report data.

Deadline for returning completed forms is June 30, 1991.

If your program extends through the summer, please contact the Agency for an alternative deadline date.

Return the cover page, data forms, Program Synopsis, and any attachments to:

Texas Education Agency
Division of Program Evaluation (Chapter 2)
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701-1494

For technical assistance, please call: (512) 463-9524.

______________________ ______________________
District Name County-Dist. No.

______________________ ______________________
Campus Name Campus Number

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY

CHAPTER 2 COMPREHENSIVE EFFECTIVENESS EVALUATION REPORT FOR SCHOOL YEAR 1990-91

TARGETED AREA: INNOVATIVE PROJECTS

Report Prepared By: ______________________
Position: ______________________
Address: ______________________
Phone #: ______________________

Return the following items:

- Cover page
- Data forms
- Program Synopsis
- Attachments

Mail to:

Texas Education Agency
Division of Program Evaluation (Chapter 2)
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701-1494

For technical assistance, please call:
Division of Program Evaluation
(512) 463-9524.

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY

______________________	______________________
District Name	County-Dist. No.
______________________	______________________
Campus Name	Campus Number

INNOVATIVE PROJECTS

______ District-wide program.

______ Campus or special facility program.

PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS DATA

1. How is your Chapter 2 Innovative Project program offered to students?

   ______ regular school year
   ______ summer program only
   ______ regular school year and summer program

2. How many 1990-91 students are being (or will be) served or targeted by this project? ______

3. What grade levels are being served or targeted?

   ______ Pre-K
   ______ K - 5
   ______ 6 - 8
   ______ 9 - 12

4. What types of students are being (or will be) served by this program? (check all that apply)

   ______ At-risk
   ______ Gifted
   ______ Disadvantaged
   ______ Handicapped
   ______ Regular/Mainstream
   ______ Other (please specify) ______________

5. To what extent was the program implemented? (circle your response)

   a. program was not implemented
   b. program was partially implemented
   c. program was implemented as planned
   d. program was implemented as planned and was expanded beyond original design

____________________ District Name

____________________ County-Dist. No.

6. If the program was not implemented, or only partially implemented, briefly explain why. (Attach another sheet if necessary.)

7. What data sources are being used presently to determine if the outcomes of your Chapter 2 Innovative Project are being met? (check all that apply)

   ____ classroom observations
   ____ surveys (interviews, questionnaires) of teachers and staff
   ____ surveys (interviews, questionnaires) of parents
   ____ surveys (interviews, questionnaires) of students
   ____ student products (portfolios)
   ____ school records
   ____ standardized achievement tests
   ____ locally developed tests
   ____ other (please specify)______________________________

8. Below is a list of possible observed outcomes that may be attributed to an effective Chapter 2 Innovative Project. Please check all outcomes for which your district has evidence.

   ____ improved grades
   ____ improved attendance
   ____ improved classroom participation
   ____ improved attitudes about school
   ____ improved student conduct
   ____ improved promotion rate
   ____ improved graduation rate
   ____ improved achievement test scores
   ____ other (please specify) ____________________

9. What specific documentation can you provide to support the observed outcomes indicated in #8 above? (Please refer to the General Instructions sent to your district's Chapter 2 contact person)

   ____
   ____
   ____
   ____

_______________ District Name

_______________ County-Dist. No.

10. If you have existing information already available or that will be available on or before June 30, 1991, then provide the following data for those students who actually participated in the chapter 2 Innovative Project:

Students showed increased classroom participation _____
Students showed improvement in discipline _____
Students showed improved attendance _____
Students showed improved grades _____
Students showed improved attitudes _____

11. Total # staff actively involved in this Chapter 2 project. _____

12. Total # staff that received special training/professional development for working with the students in this project. _____

13. Please provide other evidence and/or information that indicates how student performance objectives were achieved. For example, a report on students' participation in a science fair. Attach another sheet if necessary.

(PLEASE COMPLETE THE PROGRAM SYNOPSIS FORM ON THE NEXT PAGE)

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY

District Name ____________	County-Dist. No. ____________
Campus Name ____________	Campus Number ____________

CHAPTER 2 COMPREHENSIVE EFFECTIVENESS EVALUATION 1990-91

PROGRAM SYNOPSIS

TARGETED AREA: INNOVATIVE PROJECTS

Project Title ____
Amount of Funds for Project ___________ Campus_______ District-wide______
Number of Students Targeted ___________ Number Staff Involved_______
Grade Levels Targeted _________________

(Responses must be typed)

1. General description of the program and activities conducted.

2. Major objectives of the program; outcomes expected.

3. Describe those benefits to students and staff members that have been made possible through the Chapter 2 sponsored project that otherwise would not have been available. Include evidence of effectiveness by citing accomplishments and providing indications of positive outcomes.

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY

CHAPTER 2 COMPREHENSIVE EFFECTIVENESS EVALUATION REPORT
FOR SCHOOL YEAR 1990-91

TARGETED AREA: ACQUISITION AND USE OF INSTRUCTIONAL AND EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS

INSTRUCTIONS

- This form should be completed by the person in your district who is most familiar with the implementation of the Chapter 2-sponsored acquisition and use of instructional materials and computer equipment.
- Submit available data: If your district uses any existing instruments for evaluating your program's effectiveness (e.g., surveying teachers or students who use the materials), please submit a report that summarizes your data. This report would be an addition to, not a substitute for, the enclosed data forms. Please attach a copy of any data collection instrument from which you report data.
- You may submit any additional summary data or other evidence you have available that contribute information about the effectiveness of your Chapter 2 program.
- **The last page of these forms asks for a "Program Synopsis". This form must be typed.**

Deadline for returning completed forms is June 30, 1991.

If your program lasts through the summer, please contact the Agency for an alternative deadline date.

Return this cover page, the data forms, Program Synopsis, and any attachments to:

Texas Education Agency
Division of Program Evaluation (Chapter 2)
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701-1494

For technical assistance, please call: (512) 463-9524.

________________________ District Name

________________________ County-Dist. No.

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY

CHAPTER 2 COMPREHENSIVE EFFECTIVENESS EVALUATION REPORT
FOR SCHOOL YEAR 1990-91

TARGETED AREA: ACQUISITION AND USE OF INSTRUCTIONAL AND EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS

Report Prepared By: ____
Position: ____
Address: ____
Phone #: ____

Return the following items to the Texas Education Agency:

- Cover page
- Data forms
- Program Synopsis
- Attachments

Mail to:

Texas Education Agency
Division of Program Evaluation (Chapter 2)
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701-1494

For technical assistance, please call:
Division of Program Evaluation
(512) 463-9524.

______________________ ______________________
District Name County-Dist. No.

CHAPTER 2 COMPREHENSIVE EFFECTIVENESS EVALUATION REPORT FOR SCHOOL YEAR 1990-91

TARGETED AREA: ACQUISITION AND USE OF INSTRUCTIONAL AND EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS

DISTRICT LEVEL REPORT FORM

1. Was your project part of a larger district-wide program?
   Yes ______ No ______

2. Estimate what percentage of your program targeted the needs of at-risk students. ______%

3. What type(s) of equipment were acquired?
   (Check all that apply)

   ____ Library related equipment
   ____ Audio/Visual equipment (including video, TV)
   ____ Computer hardware/equipment
   ____ Computer software
   ____ Laboratory equipment
   ____ Other ____________________________

4. What type(s) of materials were acquired? (Check all that apply)

   ____ Curriculum materials
   ____ Library books, related materials
   ____ manipulatives
   ____ videotapes
   ____ audio/visual kits
   ____ maps, globes
   ____ supplementary textbooks
   ____ supplemental printed materials
   ____ other ____________________________________

5. What were the purposes for acquiring the instructional materials?

   ____ Program enrichment
   ____ Remedial instruction
   ____ Other ____________________________

District Name ____________________ County-Dist. No. ____________________

6. Please indicate if you have observed improvement in any of the areas below that could be a result of the materials and/or equipment purchased with Chapter 2 funds. (Check all that apply)

_____ Effective instructional methods in the classroom
_____ Student academic performance in the area targeted by the materials/equipment
_____ Students' academic performance overall
_____ Students' interest in the (involved academic area) specific subject matter targeted by materials/equipment
_____ Students' active participation in classroom activities
_____ Students' use of the educational resources available to them such as the library-media center, computer work stations, etc.
_____ Students' completion of academic tasks
_____ Students' attitudes about attending school
_____ Students' reading habits
_____ Students' attitude about learning in general
_____ Other areas: (specify)____________________________________

7. What specific documentation can you provide to support the areas you checked above?

____
____
____

8. What types of data sources are being used presently (or will be used) to determine if the outcomes of your Chapter 2 equipment/ materials acquisition program are being met? (Check all that apply)

____ Teacher/staff surveys (interviews, questionnaires)
____ Library staff surveys (interviews, questionnaires)
____ Student surveys (interviews, questionnaires)
____ Student products (portfolios, etc.)
____ Parent surveys (interviews, questionnaires)
____ Classroom observations
____ School records
____ Standardized achievement tests
____ Locally developed tests
____ Other (please specify)____________________________________

9. In general, how effective have the instructional materials and, or the computer equipment acquired through Chapter 2 funds been in improving the overall quality of education at your school? (Circle your response)

1 Not effective
2 Slightly effective
3 Moderately effective
4 Very effective
NA Not Applicable; No opinion

District Name

County-Dist. No.

Narrative Component:

Describe briefly the greatest contribution, or asset, to your district made possible by the existence of Chapter 2 funds.

(PLEASE COMPLETE THE PROGRAM SYNOPSIS ON THE NEXT PAGE)

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY

District Name	County-Dist. No.
Campus Name	Campus Number

CHAPTER 2 COMPREHENSIVE EFFECTIVENESS EVALUATION 1990-91

PROGRAM SYNOPSIS

TARGETED AREA: ACQUISITION AND USE OF INSTRUCTIONAL AND EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS

Project Title ______________________________
Amount of Funds for Project __________ Campus______ District-wide______
Number of Students Targeted __________ Number Staff Involved______
Grade Levels Targeted ______________

(Responses must be typed)

1. General description of the program and activities conducted.

2. Major objectives of the program; outcomes expected.

3. Describe those benefits to students and staff members that have been made possible through the Chapter 2 sponsored project that otherwise would not have been available. Include evidence of effectiveness by citing accomplishments and providing indications of positive outcomes.

APPENDIX E

STATEWIDE SUMMARY OF CHAPTER 2 TARGETED ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS (80% FORMULA FUNDS)

13:44 THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1992

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY

CH2EV825

**** PRELIMINARY STATEWIDE TOTALS ****

DISTRICT NAME: STATEWIDE SUMMARY 1990-91 COUNTY-DISTRICT: ALL

CHAPTER 2 TARGETED ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS (80% FORMULA) FUNDED UNDER SAS-201

TABLE 1 - COUNTS OF STUDENTS AND EDUCATORS SERVED AND TYPES OF SERVICES

**** PUBLIC TOTALS ****

		GRADE LEVELS SERVED			AMOUNT
		EE,PK,K	GR 1-6	GR 7-12	BUDGETED
		NUMBER OF STUDENTS SERVED			
(1) PROGRAMS TO SERVE STUDENTS AT RISK WHOSE EDUCATION ENTAILS HIGHER THAN AVERAGE COSTS	1.	45,952	312,976	187,886	$ 7,190,647
(2) PROGRAMS TO ACQUIRE AND USE:		NUMBER OF STUDENTS SERVED			
A. LIBRARY MATERIALS	2.A	88,827	609,693	414,471	3,865,507
B. COMPUTER SOFTWARE/HARDWARE	2.B	46,020	246,874	194,752	4,006,467
C. OTHER INSTRUCTION/EDUCATION MATERIALS	2.C	82,340	373,627	334,161	2,227,638
(3) INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS:		NUMBER OF STUDENTS SERVED			
A. SCHOOLWIDE IMPROVEMENTS	3.A	33,073	153,387	78,670	1,089,347
B. EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS PROGRAMS	3.B	38,833	205,009	107,156	1,231,100
(4) PROGRAMS OF TRAINING AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF:		NUMBER OF EDUCATORS SERVED			
A. TEACHERS, LIBRARIANS, SCHOOL COUNSELORS, AND OTHER PUPIL SERVICES PERSONNEL ASSOCIATED WITH PARTICULAR GRADE LEVELS	4.A	8,580	54,551	33,022	2,371,422
B. ADMINISTRATORS, SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS, ETC. NOT ASSOCIATED WITH PARTICULAR GRADE LEVELS	4.B	-- ALL GRADES --		5,671	180,381
(5) PROGRAMS DESIGNED TO ENHANCE PERSONAL EXCELLENCE OF STUDENTS AND STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT, INCLUDING INSTRUCTION IN:		NUMBER OF STUDENTS SERVED			
A. ETHICS	5.A	8,773	35,630	24,122	69,842
B. PERFORMING AND CREATIVE ARTS	5.B	2,112	38,668	18,165	356,503
C. HUMANITIES	5.C	262	1,169	1,093	5,936
D. PHYSICAL FITNESS	5.D	394	6,875	196	22,783
E. COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH EDUCATION	5.E	1,021	4,651	4,694	42,233
F. COMMUNITY SERVICE	5.F	58	978	245	5,720
G. OTHER	5.G	2,545	59,317	19,227	451,693
(6) OTHER INNOVATIVE PROJECTS THAT WOULD ENHANCE THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM AND CLIMATE OF THE SCHOOL, INCLUDING:		NUMBER OF STUDENTS SERVED			
A. PROGRAMS FOR GIFTED AND TALENTED STUDENTS	6.A	11,830	32,325	8,939	1,908,849
B. TECHNOLOGY EDUCATION PROGRAMS	6.B	28,821	139,555	104,465	1,067,465
C. EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAMS	6.C	8,343			228,849
D. COMMUNITY EDUCATION	6.D	123	2,113	59	24,216
E. PROGRAMS FOR YOUTH SUICIDE PREVENTION	6.E	.	40	8	1,849
F. OTHER	6.F	8,836	79,624	18,047	880,471
(7) ADMINISTRATION OF THE CHAPTER 2 PROGRAM	7.				701,202
**** TOTAL OF BUDGETED AMOUNTS ****					$27,930,120

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

13:44 THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1992

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY

CH2EV825

**** PRELIMINARY STATEWIDE TOTALS ****

DISTRICT NAME: STATEWIDE SUMMARY   1990-91   COUNTY-DISTRICT: ALL

CHAPTER 2 TARGETED ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS (80% FORMULA) FUNDED UNDER SAS-201
TABLE 2 - COUNTS OF STUDENTS AND EDUCATORS SERVED AND TYPES OF SERVICES
* * * NONPUBLIC TOTALS * * *

		GRADE LEVELS SERVED			AMOUNT
		EE,PK,K	GR 1-6	GR 7-12	BUDGETED
		NUMBER OF STUDENTS SERVED			
(1) PROGRAMS TO SERVE STUDENTS AT RISK WHOSE EDUCATION ENTAILS HIGHER THAN AVERAGE COSTS	1.	536	2,151	2,498	$ 29,192
(2) PROGRAMS TO ACQUIRE AND USE:		NUMBER OF STUDENTS SERVED			
A. LIBRARY MATERIALS	2.A	9,169	51,033	23,018	426,009
B. COMPUTER SOFTWARE/HARDWARE	2.B	4,436	19,709	10,660	139,417
C. OTHER INSTRUCTION/EDUCATION MATERIALS	2.C	5,204	18,745	8,770	163,088
(3) INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS:		NUMBER OF STUDENTS SERVED			
A. SCHOOLWIDE IMPROVEMENTS	3.A	.	80	80	647
B. EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS PROGRAMS	3.B	158	106	.	1,739
(4) PROGRAMS OF TRAINING AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF:		NUMBER OF EDUCATORS SERVED			
A. TEACHERS, LIBRARIANS, SCHOOL COUNSELORS, AND OTHER PUPIL SERVICES PERSONNEL ASSOCIATED WITH PARTICULAR GRADE LEVELS	4.A	216	669	215	32,322
B. ADMINISTRATORS, SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS, ETC. NOT ASSOCIATED WITH PARTICULAR GRADE LEVELS	4.B	-- ALL GRADES --		132	8,241
(5) PROGRAMS DESIGNED TO ENHANCE PERSONAL EXCELLENCE OF STUDENTS AND STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT, INCLUDING INSTRUCTION IN:		NUMBER OF STUDENTS SERVED			
A. ETHICS	5.A	.	.	.	.
B. PERFORMING AND CREATIVE ARTS	5.B	.	.	100	1,158
C. HUMANITIES	5.C	.	.	.	.
D. PHYSICAL FITNESS	5.D	.	88	.	324
E. COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH EDUCATION	5.E	.	88	.	374
F. COMMUNITY SERVICE	5.F	.	.	.	.
G. OTHER	5.G	.	75	.	605
(6) OTHER INNOVATIVE PROJECTS THAT WOULD ENHANCE THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM AND CLIMATE OF THE SCHOOL, INCLUDING:		NUMBER OF STUDENTS SERVED			
A. PROGRAMS FOR GIFTED AND TALENTED STUDENTS	6.A	308	1,965	324	16,751
B. TECHNOLOGY EDUCATION PROGRAMS	6.B	135	471	.	2,209
C. EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAMS	6.C	55			540
D. COMMUNITY EDUCATION	6.D	.	.	.	.
E. PROGRAMS FOR YOUTH SUICIDE PREVENTION	6.E		.	.	.
F. OTHER	6.F	44	14	.	462
(7) ADMINISTRATION OF THE CHAPTER 2 PROGRAM	7.				8,285

**** TOTAL OF BUDGETED AMOUNTS **** $ 831,363

13:44 THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1992

TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY

CH2EV825

**** PRELIMINARY STATEWIDE TOTALS ****

DISTRICT NAME: STATEWIDE SUMMARY 1990-91 COUNTY-DISTRICT: ALL

CHAPTER 2 TARGETED ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS (80% FORMULA) FUNDED UNDER SAS-201
COUNTS OF STUDENTS AND EDUCATORS SERVED AND TYPES OF SERVICES
COMBINED PUBLIC & NONPUBLIC TOTALS

		GRADE LEVELS SERVED			AMOUNT BUDGETED
		EE,PK,K	GR 1-6	GR 7-12	
		NUMBER OF STUDENTS SERVED			
(1) PROGRAMS TO SERVE STUDENTS AT RISK WHOSE EDUCATION ENTAILS HIGHER THAN AVERAGE COSTS	1.	46,488	315,127	190,384	$ 7,219,839
(2) PROGRAMS TO ACQUIRE AND USE:		NUMBER OF STUDENTS SERVED			
A. LIBRARY MATERIALS	2.A	97,996	660,726	437,489	4,291,516
B. COMPUTER SOFTWARE/HARDWARE	2.B	50,456	266,583	205,412	4,145,884
C. OTHER INSTRUCTION/EDUCATION MATERIALS	2.C	87,544	392,372	342,931	2,390,726
(3) INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS:		NUMBER OF STUDENTS SERVED			
A. SCHOOLWIDE IMPROVEMENTS	3.A	33,073	153,467	78,750	1,089,994
B. EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS PROGRAMS	3.B	38,991	205,115	107,156	1,232,839
(4) PROGRAMS OF TRAINING AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF:		NUMBER OF EDUCATORS SERVED			
A. TEACHERS, LIBRARIANS, SCHOOL COUNSELORS, AND OTHER PUPIL SERVICES PERSONNEL ASSOCIATED WITH PARTICULAR GRADE LEVELS	4.A	8,796	55,220	33,237	2,403,744
B. ADMINISTRATORS, SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS, ETC. NOT ASSOCIATED WITH PARTICULAR GRADE LEVELS	4.B	-- ALL GRADES --		5,803	188,622
(5) PROGRAMS DESIGNED TO ENHANCE PERSONAL EXCELLENCE OF STUDENTS AND STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT, INCLUDING INSTRUCTION IN:		NUMBER OF STUDENTS SERVED			
A. ETHICS	5.A	8,773	35,630	24,122	69,842
B. PERFORMING AND CREATIVE ARTS	5.B	2,112	38,668	18,265	357,661
C. HUMANITIES	5.C	262	1,169	1,093	5,936
D. PHYSICAL FITNESS	5.D	394	6,963	196	23,107
E. COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH EDUCATION	5.E	1,021	4,739	4,694	42,607
F. COMMUNITY SERVICE	5.F	58	978	245	5,720
G. OTHER	5.G	2,545	59,392	19,227	452,298
(6) OTHER INNOVATIVE PROJECTS THAT WOULD ENHANCE THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM AND CLIMATE OF THE SCHOOL, INCLUDING:		NUMBER OF STUDENTS SERVED			
A. PROGRAMS FOR GIFTED AND TALENTED STUDENTS	6.A	12,138	34,290	9,263	1,925,600
B. TECHNOLOGY EDUCATION PROGRAMS	6.B	28,956	140,026	104,465	1,069,674
C. EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAMS	6.C	6,398			229,389
D. COMMUNITY EDUCATION	6.D	123	2,113	59	24,216
E. PROGRAMS FOR YOUTH SUICIDE PREVENTION	6.E	.	40	8	1,849
F. OTHER	6.F	8,880	79,638	18,047	880,933
(7) ADMINISTRATION OF THE CHAPTER 2 PROGRAM	7.				709,487

**** TOTAL OF BUDGETED AMOUNTS **** $28,761,483

COMPLIANCE STATEMENT

TITLE VI, CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964; THE MODIFIED COURT ORDER, CIVIL ACTION 5281, FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT, EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS, TYLER DIVISION

Reviews of local education agencies pertaining to compliance with Title VI Civil Rights Act of 1964 and with specific requirements of the Modified Court Order, Civil Action No. 5281, Federal District Court, Eastern District of Texas, Tyler Division are conducted periodically by staff representatives of the Texas Education Agency. These reviews cover at least the following policies and practices:

(1) acceptance policies on student transfers from other school districts;

(2) operation of school bus routes or runs on a non-segregated basis;

(3) nondiscrimination in extracurricular activities and the use of school facilities;

(4) nondiscriminatory practices in the hiring, assigning, promoting, paying, demoting, reassigning, or dismissing of faculty and staff members who work with children;

(5) enrollment and assignment of students without discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin;

(6) nondiscriminatory practices relating to the use of a student's first language; and

(7) evidence of published procedures for hearing complaints and grievances.

In addition to conducting reviews, the Texas Education Agency staff representatives check complaints of discrimination made by a citizen or citizens residing in a school district where it is alleged discriminatory practices have occurred or are occurring.

Where a violation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act is found, the findings are reported to the Office for Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Education.

If there is a direct violation of the Court Order in Civil Action No. 5281 that cannot be cleared through negotiation, the sanctions required by the Court Order are applied.

TITLE VII, CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964; EXECUTIVE ORDERS 11246 AND 11375; TITLE IX, 1973 EDUCATION AMENDMENTS; REHABILITATION ACT OF 1973 AS AMENDED; 1974 AMENDMENTS TO THE WAGE-HOUR LAW EXPANDING THE AGE DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1967; AND VIETNAM ERA VETERANS READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1972 AS AMENDED IN 1974.

It is the policy of the Texas Education Agency to comply fully with the nondiscrimination provisions of all federal and state laws and regulations by assuring that no person shall be excluded from consideration for recruitment, selection, appointment, training, promotion, retention, or any other personnel action, or be denied any benefits or participation in any programs or activities which it operates on the grounds of race, religion, color, national origin, sex, handicap, age, or veteran status (except where age, sex, or handicap constitute a bona fide occupational qualification necessary to proper and efficient administration). The Texas Education Agency makes positive efforts to employ and advance in employment all protected groups.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Texas Education Agency
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701-1494

March 1992

BEST COPY AVAILABLE